

THE LIBRARY

EDITED BY
JOHN MACILISTER
F.S.A.

APRIL
1906



PRICE 2/6

ELLIS

**Dealer in Old and Rare Books, Manuscripts, Prints,
and Autographs**

CATALOGUES of recent purchases issued periodically and sent post free on receipt of six stamps.

SCARCE BOOKS searched for and reported.

COMMISSIONS executed at all Sales by Auction.

Libraries catalogued and arranged.

29, NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

MUDIE'S LIBRARY

TOWN SUBSCRIPTIONS

From ONE GUINEA per annum.

WEEKLY DELIVERY DEPARTMENT (for exchange of Books at the houses of Subscribers) from TWO GUINEAS per annum.

COUNTRY SUBSCRIPTIONS.

From TWO GUINEAS per annum.

N.B.—Two or Three friends may UNITE IN ONE SUBSCRIPTION, and thus lessen the cost of Carriage.

ENGLISH AND FOREIGN BOOKS AVAILABLE ON ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Town and Village Clubs supplied on Liberal Terms.

Prospectuses and Monthly Lists of Books gratis and post free.

SURPLUS LIBRARY BOOKS

NOW OFFERED AT GREATLY REDUCED PRICES.

A NEW CLEARANCE LIST (100 Pages) sent Gratis and Post Free to any Address.

The List contains POPULAR WORKS in TRAVEL, SPORT, HISTORY, THEOLOGY, BIOGRAPHY, SCIENCE, and FICTION. Also New and SURPLUS COPIES of FRENCH, GERMAN, ITALIAN, SPANISH, and RUSSIAN BOOKS.

Books shipped to all parts of the World at lowest rates.

BOOKBINDING DEPARTMENT.

BINDING AFTER ANY PATTERN OR DESIGN CARRIED OUT BY THE BEST WORKMEN.

BOOKS BOUND IN THE SHORTEST POSSIBLE TIME.

Specially Strong Leather for Libraries and Book Clubs.

**MUDIE'S LIBRARY, Limited, 30 to 34, New Oxford Street, W.C. ;
241, BROMPTON RD., S.W. ; 48, QUEEN VICTORIA ST., E.C. LONDON.**

All Communications respecting Advertisement space

in **THE LIBRARY** should be addressed to

ALEXANDER MORING, Limited,

31, George Street,

Hanover Square, W.

ts,

receipt

Y

ONS.

num.

may

ION,

re.

ost

LOGY,

es of

x.

ON.


pace

W.

THE LIBRARY.

NOTES AND ADDITIONS TO THE CENSUS OF COPIES OF THE SHAKE- SPEARE FIRST FOLIO.

I.

HREE and a quarter years ago—in December, 1902—I published, by way of supplement to the Oxford facsimile of the Shakespeare First Folio, a 'Census' in which were enumerated all extant copies of the First Folio that were then known to me. Long before my work was published, I had circulated appeals for co-operation wherever there seemed any likelihood that information would be forthcoming. The generous assistance, which was given me both in this country and abroad, enabled my record to reach the large total of one hundred and fifty-eight copies. Whatever the defects of the research, I may fairly claim to have achieved a greater measure of completeness than had characterized earlier explorations in the same field. Some eighty years before, the garrulous bibliographer Thomas Frognall Dibdin declared (in his 'Library Companion') that no more than twenty-six copies of the volume had

come under his notice. Thomas Rodd, the chief London bookseller of the first half of last century, claimed (in 1840) to have compiled a list of eighty copies, but unfortunately he did not print his results, and they have vanished. The bibliographical publisher, Henry George Bohn, in 1863 described somewhat cursorily and confusedly in his new edition of Lowndes' 'Bibliographer's Manual,' thirty-nine copies. In 1897 contributors to 'Notes and Queries,' under Mr. Holcombe Ingleby's enthusiastic leadership, enumerated fifty copies.¹ It was my fortune to increase that number by as many as one hundred and eight copies, of which none, as far as I know, had been publicly described before. It should be understood that I took account of copies in all conditions of cleanliness and completeness.

My 'Census' demonstrated two points, both of which had long been vaguely suspected. In the first place, it plainly appeared that, although extant exemplars in a fine state were few, yet perfect First Folios, far from being 'excessively rare,' were more numerous than perfect copies of other great books of the same era. In the second place, it became obvious that, as soon as we embodied in one systematic survey the more or less imperfect copies of this great collection of Shakespeare's plays, it was difficult to point to a publication of the early seventeenth century which had more triumphantly faced the

¹ Supplementary efforts to describe copies that had found their way to America did not prove more exhaustive. Mr. Justin Winsor in 1875 gave very careful descriptions of eighteen copies in the United States of America, and in 1888 Mr. W. H. Fleming wrote very fully of thirteen copies in the city of New York.

perils of physical decay, and all the wear and tear of handling, to which popular books are always liable.

To a large extent it was pioneer work in which I engaged in 1902, and errors and omissions were inevitable. In spite of the unexpected length to which my list ran, there was no ground for treating it as exhaustive. Within a month of its publication three owners, who had failed to communicate with me earlier, wrote to me of copies which had escaped my observation. Other collectors at later dates gave me similar proofs of the imperfections of my record. Although the new information does not materially affect any published results, it forms an indispensable supplement to the already printed record. I therefore readily accept the invitation of the editors of 'The Library' to give their readers some account of the copies, of the existence of which I was ignorant in 1902, and generally to bring my results up to present date.

II.

At the outset I take the opportunity of making some minor corrections. I have to confess three errors in my account of copies now in America which already figure in the 'Census.'

Of these errors I reckon the most important to be that touching the condition of the copy which is now the property of Mrs. Leiter of Washington (No. LIII).¹ I had been informed by a member of the owner's family that the preliminary leaf,

¹ The numbers in roman numerals enclosed in brackets throughout this article, represent the position allotted to the cited copies in my 'Census.'

headed 'A catalogue of the seuerall Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies contained in this Volume,' was missing. But a recent examination of the copy by Mr. Hugh Morrison, of the Congress Library at Washington shows that the leaf was present though in an unusual place. The copy ought therefore to be numbered in the class of forty-three perfect exemplars instead of in the first division of the second class of eighty imperfect exemplars, in which to my regret I located it.¹ It is less important to note that I somewhat depreciated the condition of the First Folio in the Newberry Library at Chicago (No. CXVII.). I inspected that copy on my visit to the library on 4th April, 1903, and discovered that several preliminary leaves following the title-page which I had reported, from the information given me by a correspondent, to be in facsimile, were in their original state. My description of the fly-leaf and title-page as modern reproductions was, however, confirmed, and consequently the Newberry copy, although it was entitled to a somewhat higher place than I had bestowed on it, does not merit promotion above the second division of my second class. I had placed it in the third division of that class. If I had unwittingly undervalued the Leiter and the Newberry copies, I fear I had overvalued a third American copy. In the case of the First Folio (No. XXXVII.), which belongs to Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan of New York, much detailed evidence has recently come into my hands to show that I had over-estimated its historic interest. Already

¹ I have already acknowledged this mistake in the 'Athenæum' for January 13th of this year.

I had reason to believe that the book had been perfected from the somewhat damaged copy, lacking the portrait and title, which had belonged to the late Leonard Lawrie Hartley. But I did not know what I have been lately told on good authority, that the old binding stamped with the arms of Robert Sidney, second Earl of Leicester (1595-1667), which now distinguishes the book, is a recent substitute, derived from some other ancient tome, for a different old binding, stamped, it is said, with a bishop's armorial bearings, which covered the volume when Mr. Hartley was its owner.¹

Before I deal with the newly-discovered copies, it becomes me to notice such changes as death or some less imperative circumstance has wrought in the ownership of copies which I have already described. At least fourteen of my entries are thereby affected. Five owners, whose names figure in my 'Census,' have died since the work was printed, viz.: Lord Glanusk (No. LXXVIII.), Lord Leigh (No. LXXXII.), the Rev. Sir Richard

¹ Mr. Henry R. Davis of Clissold House, Clissold Park, London, who has followed the history of Mr. Morgan's copy very closely, owns the millboards of its original binding, which was, he tells me, stripped off after Mr. James Toovey bought it for £250 at the Hartley sale on 19th April, 1887. Owners of the volume preceding Mr. Hartley, whom I overlooked, included Sir John Sebright of Beechwood, Hertfordshire, whose collection was dispersed in 1807, and Robert Willis, F.R.S. (1800-1875), the well-known archaeologist and Professor of Mechanics at Cambridge. The copy seems to have been sold by Professor Willis at Hodgson's sale room on 8th April, 1872, for £20 10s., the smallness of the sum being due to some unjustifiable misconception about a leaf in the middle of the volume. Hartley appears to have been the purchaser on that occasion. The volume is numbered 478 in the sale catalogue of the third portion of the Hartley Library, 1887.

Fitzherbert, Bart. (No. LXXVII.), Mr. W. Hughes Hilton of Sale, Cheshire (No. CIX.), and Mr. L. Z. Leiter of Chicago and Washington (No. LIII.). But in all these cases the copies still remain in the hands of the family of the former owner, so that little alteration in my printed text is at present needed. Three copies, which belonged to booksellers in 1902, viz.: those assigned respectively in my 'Census' to Mr. Charles Scribner of New York (No. XIII.); to Mr. William Jaggard of Liverpool (No. CXI.); and to Messrs. Pearson and Co. of London (No. CXLVIII.) are now in private libraries. Messrs. Pearson sold their copy to a New York bookseller who has since died. Six further copies in private libraries have lately acquired new owners by public or private sale. Of these, one was already in America, and still remains there in different hands; five, which were in England in 1902, have since crossed the Atlantic to add bulk and dignity to the growing American cohort of copies.

The most interesting of these migrations is that of the First Folio which is numbered X. in the first division of my first class. This Folio was acquired by Mr. Bernard Buchanan MacGeorge of Glasgow in Messrs. Christie's Sale Room, July, 1899, for what was then the record price of £1,700. The copy remained in Mr. MacGeorge's library until June, 1905, when it passed into the great Shakespearean collection of Mr. Marsden J. Perry of Providence, Rhode Island. The transaction included the transfer of the Second, Third, and Fourth Folios, as well as the First, and for the four volumes Mr. Perry paid the unheard-of sum of £10,000.

All the books were in good condition. The Second Folio came from the Earl of Orford's library, and was acquired by Mr. MacGeorge for the high price of £540 in 1895. It is not easy, in a negotiation carried through on such princely terms, to determine the precise value set by Mr. Perry on Mr. MacGeorge's First Folio apart from the later Folios. The record prices hitherto fetched at public sales for each of the four volumes are at present as follows :

FIRST FOLIO. £1,720 for the Dormer-Hunter copy (No. XIII.) at Christie's 27th July, 1901. (This copy was subsequently acquired by Mr. Charles Scribner of New York, and has since been sold by him at an enhanced price to a private American collector.)

SECOND FOLIO. £690, at Sotheby's, 21st March, 1902, for a copy with the rare 'John Smethwick' imprint. (This was acquired by Mr. Perry of Providence.)

THIRD FOLIO. £755 for Lieut.-Col. E. G. Hibbert's copy at Sotheby's, April, 1902. (This exemplar had the two different title-pages dated 1663 and 1664 respectively.)

FOURTH FOLIO. £215 at Sotheby's, 8th December, 1903, for a copy with an exceptional imprint.

Thus at public sales the four Folios in their rarest states have not fetched a larger aggregate sum than £3,380. Mr. Perry last year trebled that record. We must therefore credit him with having purchased the MacGeorge First Folio (viewed separately from its three companions) for some

gigantic sum not less than £6,000. This figure is reached by valuing the accompanying Second, Third, and Fourth Folios at three times the highest public sale rate, and then deducting their total from the £10,000 which Mr. Perry paid Mr. MacGeorge for the four. It is impossible to estimate the cost of Mr. Perry's First Folio at any lower sum. It is familiar knowledge that the First Folio, which Mr. Perry has now secured for £6,000 or more, was originally bought in 1623 for £1. Far greater is the appreciation of the original quarto edition of Shakespeare's 'Titus Andronicus,' which, published in 1594 at sixpence, was sold last year for £2,000. But, in view of Mr. Perry's great venture, the First Folio bids fair to become the most expensive (absolutely) of all printed books.

I know fewer details respecting the transfer to American owners of four other copies, which stand in my 'Census' of 1902 associated with the name of English owners, but have since been sold to American collectors. None of the four are of first rate importance. All were placed in the second division of my second class of (imperfect) copies. Lord Tweedmouth's copy (No. XC.) passed privately to America through Mr. Quaritch some two years ago. The remaining three were disposed of at public auction—two at the same sale to the same American collector. The better of these two belonged to Mr. W. G. Lacy (No. LXXX.), and was sold in June, 1903, for £385. The Rev. R. H. Roberts' copy (No. LXXXVI.), which was issued in reduced facsimile in 1876, was sold on the same occasion for the small sum of £150. Both these copies

were acquired by Mr. H. C. Folger of New York, a collector who has purchased of late years more examples of the volume than any one before him.¹ The copy, belonging in 1902 to Mrs. Charles Hilhouse (No. LXXVIII*a.*), fetched on 21st March, 1903, at Sotheby's, £305; I only know of its present owner that he is an American citizen. One of the American exemplars which I recorded has changed hands recently at a public sale. On 3rd February of the present year, Mr. Henry Gardner Denny of Roxbury, Boston, U.S.A., sold his set of the four Folios for £1,790 (\$8,950). The purchaser was a collector of New York. Mr. Denny's First Folio, (No. CXIX.), which I placed in the third division of my second class, may fairly be reckoned to have brought more than £1,000.

III.

With the copies which have been made known to me since 1902 I break fresher ground. Fourteen copies in all have come within my survey since the

¹ I failed in 1902 to trace the present owner of two Folios (Nos. CXXII. and CXL.), which I noticed as having long been in America in private libraries which had been recently dispersed. Both, I have ascertained since, came into Mr. Folger's possession. But even thus, as the following pages will show, the list of Mr. Folger's purchases of First Folios is far from exhausted. In this connection I ought to mention that the fine Folio (No. XLI.) which was sold at Sotheby's at the dispersal of Lt.-Col. Edward George Hibbert's library on 12th April, 1902, for £1,050, was not traced in my 'Census' beyond Messrs. Pickering and Chatto's shop in Piccadilly. Mrs. Dean Sage of Albany, New York State, informed me in April, 1903, that her late husband acquired it shortly before his death in the previous year, and that it remains in her possession.

'Census' was printed. The full total of extant copies known to me, which previously stood at 158, is thereby raised to 172. All save one of these fourteen 'new' copies were in 1902 in the United Kingdom; only one was then in America. But the American demand for First Folios, which has long been the dominant feature in their history, has shown during the last three years no sign of slackening. It will therefore surprise no one to learn that these thirteen English copies are now reduced to eight. Five of them have crossed the ocean during the past three years.

Information respecting nine of the 'new' copies was sent to me by their present owners. Five of the remaining 'new' copies came to light, as far as I was concerned, in Messrs. Sotheby's sale rooms. One of the newly discovered fourteen copies is owned by a public institution, the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. The thirteen others are, and always have been, in private hands. It is perhaps matter of congratulation that, despite the recent activity of American buyers, the most interesting of recently discovered copies still remain in this country. Only one of the 'new' copies which have lately found homes in America has any title to be considered of first-class rank.

I arrange the new copies in order of value and interest, and number them consecutively.

(I.) LADY WANTAGE'S COPY. The finest of the 'new' copies belongs to Lady Wantage of Lockinge House, Berkshire, and I cordially thank her for forwarding the book to my house in order to facilitate this inquiry.

The history of the ownership can be traced back to the eighteenth century. At the back of the last leaf is scribbled, in handwriting of that era, the words 'Miss Stodart 1761.' There is another almost contemporary sign of association with a Scot. On the third leaf (which contains the dedication) is the autograph signature of 'Andrew Wilson, M.D.' He was a Scotsman who practised medicine successfully in London for many years before his death there on 4th June, 1792.

The next private owner whose name is ascertainable is Sir Coutts Trotter, the grandfather of the late Lord Wantage. Sir Coutts, who was a senior partner in Coutts' Bank, and was created a baronet at George IV's coronation (September 4th, 1821), probably acquired his First Folio towards the close of his life. Nothing is known of his connection with it until the end of 1835. According to some interesting correspondence which is preserved along with the volume, and has been sent to me by Lady Wantage, Sir Coutts at that date lent his copy to a book-loving friend, John Halkett, of Richmond Hill, who, after carefully examining it for himself, obtained a full report of its condition from his friend, John Field, a well-known contemporary collector of dramatic literature. Field's report, which is dated December 28th, 1835, pronounced the book to be perfect, with very trifling reservations, which chiefly concerned marginal fractures. He declared it to be 'a most beautiful copy indeed,' and thought that 'with the exception of two or three copies' (among which he mentioned the Grenville copy, now in the British Museum), 'this is the

finest I ever saw, or I believe in existence.' But it was in damaged binding, and in its existing state was probably not worth, in Field's opinion, more than £60. Field recommended that the binder, Charles Lewis, 'the only man to be trusted with such a book,' should be employed to repair it. Sir Coutts Trotter, a few days after he received Field's report from Halkett, begged the latter to keep the book as a mark of his esteem. But Halkett magnanimously declined the suggestion, on the just ground that Coutts' descendants a hundred years later would greatly value its possession. The binder, Lewis, died 8th January, 1836, in the course of the discussion. Halkett advised Sir Coutts to send the book for binding to Herring, a binder hardly less famous than Lewis, and to consult his friend, Thomas Grenville, the greatest collector of the day, if he wanted further counsel. But nothing had been done with the book by the date of Sir Coutts' death, 1st September, 1837. Then the volume became the property of Sir Coutts' only daughter, Anne, wife of Colonel James Lindsay, a cousin of the Earl of Crawford. In 1864 Lord Lindsay, the eminent bibliophile (afterwards twenty-fifth Earl of Crawford) carefully re-examined the Folio, and sent on August 1st a full description of it to Mrs. Lindsay, its owner. He declared the copy to be 'a very fine one, sound, and in good preservation throughout,' in spite of some 'drawbacks,' of which the most important was the removal of most of the blank portions of the fly-leaf containing Ben Jonson's verses. Mrs. Lindsay seems to have left the volume unrepaired to her second son, Colonel Robert James

Loyd-Lindsay, who became first Lord Wantage, and whose widow is the present owner. It remained in the condition in which Lord Lindsay saw it in 1864, until 1902, when it was elaborately repaired and richly bound in red levant morocco by Messrs. Rivière. A leather case was at the same time made for its safe keeping.

The measurements, which are $12\frac{7}{8} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ inches, are highly satisfactory; the highest dimensions known are $13\frac{1}{2}$ by $8\frac{3}{4}$ inches. The recent restoration mainly affects the fly-leaf and title-page. The original print of Ben Jonson's verses, save the subscribed letters B.I., which were torn off, has been carefully mounted on a new leaf; the missing letters B.I. are supplied in facsimile. The letterpress round the portrait on the title-page has been repaired, but the impression (from a late state of the plate) is crisp and clear. The last leaf is perfect, though it shows signs of having been much creased. Several small holes in the margins have been repaired. The pagination, text, and signatures show no variation from the standard collation offered by the majority of extant copies. There are none of the singularities of typography which are occasionally met with. Manuscript notes of the early eighteenth century are scribbled at the end of some of the plays. On the last page of 'Macbeth,' 'Hamlet,' and 'Julius Caesar' are manuscript lists of the 'dramatis personae.' At the end of 'Lear' is a list of characters in the succeeding tragedy of 'Othello,' and at the end of 'Antony and Cleopatra' appear these verses:

Not the Dark Palace nor the Realms below,
Or the Furious Purpose of her Soul.

Bouldly she looks on her superior woe
 Which can nor fear nor Death Controwl.
 She wil not from her fancy'd Pride desend
 Disgrac'd a Female Captive by his side
 His pompous triumph to atend
 She bouldly Runs in Death and bids her Sorrows end.

Signs are abundant that the section of tragedies in the volume has been at one time or another carefully studied. Lady Wantage's copy clearly belongs to the second division of my first class of perfect copies. Had the fly-leaf not suffered injury, it would have merited a place among the fourteen enviable copies of the first division.

(II.) THE DUKE OF NORFOLK'S COPY. Hardly less distinguished a place in the second division of the first class is due to the Duke of Norfolk's copy. Former bibliographers have referred to a copy in the possession of the Duke of Norfolk of their day. But when I made inquiries respecting it in 1901, I was informed that the only early edition of Shakespeare's collected works then known to be in the Duke's possession was a Third Folio.¹ Shortly after the publication of my 'Census' the Duke, with great courtesy, informed me that a First Folio had just come to light at Arundel, and more recently he was kind enough to send the copy to the British Museum for my inspection. The dimensions are $12\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The verses on the fly-leaf have been cut out of the original leaf and inlaid on a new leaf. The outer edge of the title-page has been roughly renewed, and the last two figures of the date, 1623, have been

¹ In my 'census' I gave seven instances (p. 12, note 3) in which a later Folio had been wrongly described as a First, and I mentioned the Duke of Norfolk's Third Folio among these copies.

cut away and inserted in facsimile. The corner edge of p. 83 (Histories) has been renewed, and the last leaf has been slightly repaired. Though the size of the copy has been considerably reduced by the binder, the outer edge of p. 79 of the Comedies is rough and uncut. The impression of the portrait is good and clear. The volume is plainly bound in dull purple morocco.

Inside the cover is pasted the book-plate of Bernard Edward, twelfth Duke of Norfolk (1765-1842); he was a man of some literary tastes, and probably acquired the volume soon after his accession to the title in 1815.

This copy has a special claim to notice, in that one of its leaves figures in an unrevised state. It is a leaf in 'Hamlet,' ordinarily numbered 277 and 278. All who have carefully examined the First Folio are aware that the type was occasionally corrected while the sheets were passing through the press. An uncorrected or a partially corrected sheet was at times suffered to reach the binder's hands. Consequently minute differences distinguish different copies of the book. In the cited leaf of 'Hamlet' there appear, in the Duke of Norfolk's copy, at least twelve misprints, which were removed before the majority of extant copies were made up. Among the one hundred and seventy-two extant copies, these twelve misprints only appear, as far as my knowledge goes, in the copy belonging to Mr. Marsden Perry of Providence, U.S.A. But a second copy, formerly in the possession of Thomas Amyot, of which the present whereabouts are unknown, was credited with the like distinction by the editors of the

Variorum Shakespeare of 1821 (vol. xxi, pp. 449-50). Curiously enough a thirteenth misprint ('Foredo' for 'for do,' p. 278, col. 2, line 3) characterizes those two copies, but this is corrected in the Duke of Norfolk's copy. Hence it is clear that, though leaf 277-8 of the Duke's First Folio represents an early setting of the type, it cannot be reckoned among quite the earliest. The corrector of the press had just begun to occupy himself with this leaf before it was printed off for the Duke's copy.¹ The twelve divergences between the partially corrected text and the standard collation of the majority of First Folios extant are as follows:

	STANDARD COLLATION.	NORFOLK COPY.
Page 277		
Page number	'277' <i>for</i>	'273.'
Col. 1, l. 9 from end	'iowles' "	'iowlos.'
Page 278		
Col. 1, l. 17	'sir, his' "	'sirh, is.'
" l. 20	'years' "	'yearys.'
" l. 41	'one thing' "	'o-n thing.'
" l. 30 from end	'Coffin' "	'Cooffin.'
Col. 2, l. 30	'Bride-bed' "	'Brid-bed.'
" "	'maid' "	'maide.'
" l. 43	'emphasis' "	'emphasies.'
" l. 52	'wisenesse' "	'wisensse.'
" l. 4 from end	'forbeare' "	'forebeare.'
" last line	'Crocodile' "	'crocadile.'

I have not noticed in the Duke's copy any other discrepancies with the standard collation, save that in the stage direction respecting the death of 'King

¹ The Marquis of Bath's copy (No. L.) indicates a later stage in the correction of the same leaf. Half of the errors here enumerated have been removed, and half have been suffered to remain.

Lear,' on the last page of that tragedy, the 'e' in *He dis* is separated from the initial letter of the word, and stands in complete isolation.

(III.) BISHOP GOTT'S COPY. The present Bishop of Truro, Dr. John Gott of Trenyhton, possesses a copy which he inherited from his father, William Gott, of Wyther Grange, Yorkshire. He describes it as quite perfect, but I have not had the opportunity of inspecting it personally.¹ The size is $12\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and the volume was rebound in red morocco half a century ago.

(IV.) THE 'GEORGE C. THOMAS' COPY. This copy which fetched the highest price since 1902 in a London sale room was sold at Sotheby's, 20 June, 1904, for £950. It was then purchased by Messrs. Pickering and Chatto, and passed to Mr. George C. Thomas, of Philadelphia, through Messrs. Stevens and Brown, the American agents.

A note on the fly-leaf records that the volume was purchased in 1772 for five guineas. The old russia binding dates from the latter half of the eighteenth century. The fly-leaf, the title-page, and the dedication leaf have all undergone some damage, but have been repaired. The margin of some other preliminary leaves, as well as the last leaf, has been mended. It is a small copy, measuring $12\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ inches.

The other newly-discovered copies make no claim

¹ The bishop also tells me that he possesses a large number of original Shakespeare quartos, including 'Hamlet,' 1611; 'Love's Labour's Lost,' 1598; 'Romeo and Juliet,' 1599; 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' 1600 (the two editions); 'Merchant of Venice,' 1600 (Roberts' 4to); 'Henry V.' (3rd edition), 1608; 'King Lear,' 1608, with some other volumes hardly less valuable.

to perfection. The next five belong to the second class of (imperfect) copies, but one of these (No. V. below) is of unique historic interest.

(V.) THE 'TURBUTT' COPY. This exemplar, now known as the 'Turbutt' copy from the surname of its recent owners, was the actual First Folio which was forwarded in sheets by the Stationers' Company to the Bodleian Library at Oxford on the publication of the volume late in 1623. The sheets were sent to William Wildgoose, an Oxford binder, to be bound on 17 February, 1623-4. On its return to the library it received the press mark, S2 17 Art., and was, according to custom, chained to the shelf.

On the publication of the Third Folio in 1664, the volume was sold as 'superfluous' by order of the curators. It was bought by Richard Davis, an Oxford bookseller, and, early in the eighteenth century, it found its way into the library of Richard Turbutt of Ogston Hall, Derbyshire, whose great great grandson is the present owner.

It is a large copy, measuring $13\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{5}{8}$ inches. The fly-leaf is missing. The title-page is mounted; the letterpress below the engraving has been cut away. The portrait, although it is inlaid, is a fine impression of the Droeshout engraving in its second (shaded) state. The binding, which is much rubbed in places, is of smooth brown calf. The leather strings have been removed, but signs of the chain which originally linked it to its shelf survive. The pages are much worn, but, with the important exception of the fly-leaf, all the leaves are present.¹

¹ Mr. Gladwyn M. R. Turbutt, son of the present owner, sent me from Ogston Hall a full account of this volume on 26th

Mr. Falconer Madan, the sub-librarian of the Bodleian Library, exhibited the volume, and fully described its pedigree at a meeting of the Bibliographical Society on 20 February, 1905. An elaborate account of 'The Original Bodleian copy of the First Folio of Shakespeare (The Turbutt Shakespeare)' was prepared jointly by Mr. Falconer Madan, Mr. G. M. R. Turbutt, and Mr. Strickland Gibson, and was printed at the Clarendon Press, with plates, in the spring of last year. An appeal has been made to Oxford graduates for a sum of money sufficient to purchase the volume and restore it to the Bodleian Library. Its value is estimated at £3,000, and all English book-lovers hope that this effort to secure the volume for Oxford in perpetuity may prove successful.

(VI.) THE 'BIXBY' COPY. This copy now belonging to Mr. W. R. Bixby of St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A., has a long ascertainable pedigree. It was in successive possession of two established families in the County of Durham from the middle of the seventeenth to the end of the nineteenth century. An entry in contemporary handwriting runs thus: 'Liber G. Spearman Dunelm. 1695.' The reference is to Gilbert Spearman, who published in 1728 an 'Inquiry into the Ancient and Present State of the County Palatine of Durham,' and died in 1738.

December, 1902, some three weeks after my 'Census' was published. He was not then aware of its association with the Bodleian Library. This was discovered early in 1905, when the book was taken to the Library by Mr. Gladwyn Turbutt for examination by Mr. Falconer Madan, the sub-librarian. A careful inspection of the binding by Mr. Strickland Gibson of the Bodleian Library, disclosed the early history of the volume.

The Spearmans resided through the eighteenth century at Oldacres, Sedgefield in the County of Durham. From them the book passed to the family of Sutton of Elton in the same county, by whom it was sold privately, in a very poor condition, to the firm of Ellis of Bond Street in May, 1900. It came into their hands a 'mere wreck.' The fly-leaf had disappeared, and the title and last leaf were damaged. The volume was carefully repaired, and bound by Rivière, the fly-leaf being supplied in facsimile. Messrs. Ellis and Elvey priced it in their catalogue of November, 1901, at £900, and next month it was acquired by its present owner through Messrs. Stevens and Brown, the American agents of London. It measures $12\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{8}$ inches, and may be placed among satisfactory copies of the second class.

(VII.) THE 'DAWSON-BRODIE-FOLGER' COPY. This copy was for some years in the stock of the late Mr. F. S. Ellis, of Bond Street. It was made up from one or two fragmentary copies which he had acquired at various times. It was purchased at his sale in 1885 for £97, by a Scottish collector, Sir Thomas Dawson-Brodie of Idvies, N.B.

It was a comparatively large copy, measuring 13×8 inches. The fly-leaf, with the preliminary leaf 'To the Memorie' were, like the letterpress of the title-page, in facsimile, but an original impression of the portrait was inlaid in the restored title. Some two hundred pages were supplied with new margins, and the last leaf had undergone reparation. It was bound by Bedford. It fetched at the sale of the library of Sir Thomas Dawson-Brodie,

on 18 March, 1904, the sum of £465, or nearly five times as much as it cost Sir Thomas. It is now the property of Mr. H. C. Folger, junr., of New York.

(VIII.) THE 'A. B. STEWART' COPY. This copy belongs to the widow of Alexander Bannatyne Stewart of Rawcliffe, Langside, Glasgow. At the end of the volume is an autograph signature of 'Tho: Bourne', who was possibly an early owner. In the middle of the nineteenth century it was in the hands of the London bookseller Joseph Lilly, a mighty trader in First Folios. Other London booksellers through whose hands it passed were Basil Montagu Pickering of Piccadilly, and F. S. Ellis of Bond Street. Before 1878 Ellis sold it, with copies of the three other Folios, for the moderate sum of three hundred guineas to the late Alexander Bannatyne Stewart, of Glasgow, whose widow is the present owner. The copy measures $12\frac{7}{16} \times 7\frac{7}{8}$ inches. The fly-leaf verses, the letterpress portion of the title, and the last two leaves are in facsimile. The corners of pages 291-292 of 'Winter's Tale' have been torn away. The volume is richly bound in red morocco. According to the report sent to me, which I have not yet been able to test by personal examination, there is a singular discrepancy at one point between this copy and all others which have been collated. The signatures and the watermark of the leaves containing the play of 'Troilus and Cressida' are normal (and unlike those of any of the later folios) but the pagination of the piece (1-29) is unique. Ordinarily, the pages of 'Troilus' are (save in two instances) unnumbered in the First Folio. The next play, 'Coriolanus,' starts in the

Stewart, as in normal copies, with a new and independent pagination (1 *seq.*).¹

(IX.) THE 'SCOTT-FOLGER' COPY. The large library of the late John Scott, C.B., of Halkhill, Largs, Ayrshire, who was by profession a ship-builder, contained a restored copy of the First Folio, of which all the preliminary leaves and last leaf were in facsimile. It measured $12\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ inches, and was richly bound by Roger de Coverley. It fetched at the sale of the Scott library on 5 April, 1905, the sum of £255, and was acquired by the American collector, Mr. H. C. Folger.

The remaining five 'new' copies are all defective, and would fill places in my third class.

(X.) SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES OF SCOTLAND COPY. The copy belonging to this Society was described by Mr. W. K. Dickson, Secretary of the Society, at a meeting of the Society held at Edinburgh on 12th February, 1906.

It was presented to the Society, according to the minute-book, by Miss Clarke of Dunbar, on 2nd November, 1784. It was bound in dark brown morocco by Messrs. Orrock and Son, of Edinburgh, about 1870. The fly-leaf and portrait title-page have been rebaked and mended. Seven leaves have disappeared. Three of the preliminary leaves are missing, viz., the dedication, the verses to the 'memorie of the deceased Authour,' and the list of actors. Four leaves of the text are missing—two of 'Romeo and Juliet,' pp. 53-6 of the Tragedies, and the last two of the whole volume,

¹ I have to thank Mrs. Stewart's son-in-law, Mr. David Laidlaw of Polmont, Stirlingshire, for all this information.

viz., pp. 397-9 of 'Cymbeline.' The margins of some thirteen leaves are injured.

It is a small copy measuring $12\frac{1}{8} \times 7\frac{7}{8}$ inches. The rare misprints, 307 for 309, and 309 for 307, in 'King Lear' are the chief discrepancies from the standard collation.

(XI.) THE 'KNIGHT-CLOWES' COPY. The external literary history gives this copy, despite its inferior condition, great interest. It belonged to Charles Knight, whose edition of Shakespeare was the most popular of all editions in the nineteenth century. Knight studied the First Folio with exceptional zeal. His copy of the volume, which now belongs to his grandson, Mr. W. C. Knight-Clowes, has peculiar fascination for students. Mr. Clowes has been good enough to lend the book to me for a long term of months. Its imperfections are, unfortunately, very palpable, and it cannot be placed above third-class copies in any catalogue *raisonné*. Of 908 original leaves 27 are lost; 881 alone survive. All but three of the preliminary leaves have disappeared, and the edges of those that survive are damaged. Other missing leaves are two leaves of 'The Taming of the Shrew,' two leaves of 'Henry VIII,' one leaf of 'Troilus' (¶), two leaves of 'Romeo and Juliet,' two leaves of 'Hamlet' (pp. 3, 4), and the last twelve leaves of 'Cymbeline,' with which the volume ends. All the missing leaves, including six in the preliminary section, have been supplied from the facsimile typed reprint of 1807. The lost leaf of the 'Merry Wives' is bound out of its due place, and has been needlessly supplied in duplicate from the 1807 reprint.

The dimensions are $12\frac{5}{16} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ inches. The volume has been roughly rebound in stamped russian leather at a comparatively recent date. There are no textual singularities. A few pages are defaced by manuscript notes, for the most part senseless scribble, in seventeenth century handwriting. On the lower part of page 204 of the Histories—at the end of the play of 'Richard III'—appear in one hand the name 'the Lady Sarah Hearst,' and in another hand, 'the Ladie Ann Grey,' and 'The Lady Mary Buccckinham.' Below the prologue to 'Troilus' is written the couplet:

When malt is cheap againe, mark w^t I say
Weele laugh, and drink, and make an hallowday.
To Baccus & Ceres.

(XII.) THE THORPE-FOLGER COPY. This copy belonged to Mr. W. G. Thorpe of the Middle Temple, a somewhat eccentric student of Shakespeare, who died in the previous year—in 1903. It measures $12\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ inches, and is bound in russia. The fly-leaf, title, and five of the seven preliminary leaves are, together with the five last leaves, in facsimile by Harris. Three other leaves are supplied from the second edition of 1632. Thus fifteen of the original leaves were missing. It was acquired by Messrs. Sotheran for Mr. Folger of New York for £181, at the sale of Mr. Thorpe's library at Sotheby's on 18th April, 1904.

(XIII.) THE WALLER COPY. A large but defective copy, measuring $13 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches, fetched £420 at Sotheby's sale rooms on 29th July, 1904, when it was bought by Mr. Waller. The portrait-

title was wanting, together with the first leaf of 'Troilus and Cressida,' and the last leaf of the volume. There were several signs of injury by fire. The margins of forty leaves were burnt, in seventeen cases with injury to the text. Other defects appeared in both the preliminary leaves and the text of the plays.

(XIV.) MR. H. R. DAVIS COPY. The copy belonging to Mr. H. R. Davis, of Clissold House, Clissold Park, London, N., is in bad condition. It measures $12\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The fly-leaf verses, the portrait-title, three preliminary leaves, and about seventy leaves of the text, including six at the end, are missing. The volume is unbound. A manuscript note on p. 229, in early seventeenth-century handwriting, is addressed to Viscount Cholmondeley and his wife Katherine, and signed by Robert Shakerley, a kinsman, and another. The copy would seem, soon after its publication, to have been acquired by a member of the family of Robert Cholmondeley, who was created Viscount Cholmondeley of Kells in 1628, and Earl of Leinster in 1645.¹

IV

The general distribution of copies of the First Folio is altered slightly, but rather significantly, by recent investigations and changes of ownership. In 1902 there were one hundred and sixteen First

¹ Three exemplars, in addition to those named above, have been sold in London sale rooms since 1902, but they were in so fragmentary a condition that they must be excluded from any catalogue of substantial interest. The late Mr. William Henry Dutton of Newcastle, Staffordshire, possessed 291 leaves of one copy, and 64 leaves of another, and these fragments were both sold at Sotheby's

Folios in the United Kingdom, including the thirteen newly discovered copies which were then in Great Britain, although I did not know of their existence; fifty-one were in the United States of America (including one then unknown to me); three were in the British colonies, and two were on the continent of Europe. In addition to the five newly discovered copies, which have been sold to American citizens since 1902, five other copies, which I noticed in my 'Census' as being in 1902 in English hands, have within the same period suffered like transportation. Thus, to-day, the British total stands at one hundred and six, a decrease of ten since 1902, and the American total stands at sixty-one, an increase to the same extent. The totals for the British Colonies and for the European Continent are unaltered.

To Scotland I did, in 1902, an involuntary injustice, which the progress of time has now, as it happens, to a large extent repaired. I assigned only three copies to Scotland—one to Glasgow University, another to Mr. MacGeorge of Glasgow, and a third to Mr. W. L. Watson, of Ayton, Abernethy. But at the date at which my 'Census' was published, I was ignorant that no less than four other copies were in the Northern Kingdom; one of these belonged to a public institution, and three were in private hands. Thus, seven copies were, according to my present information, in Scotland in 1902. Of these, only four remain there to-day, viz., those re-

on 8th December, 1903, for the sums of £41 and £19 respectively. A third fragmentary copy was sold for £52 10s. to Mr. Quaritch on 1st December, 1902.

spectively in the libraries of Glasgow University, of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, of Mr. W. L. Watson, of Abernethy, and of Mrs. A. B. Stewart, of Langside. The three remaining Scottish copies are now in America. The MacGeorge copy went to Mr. Perry, of Providence, and both the Scott and the Brodie copies to Mr. Folger, of New York.

These two gentlemen, Mr. Perry and Mr. Folger, are now the keenest collectors of Shakesperiana in the world. Mr. Folger is to be congratulated on having acquired in the last few years as many as eight copies of the First Folio in all—a record number for any private collector.

If the tide continue running so strongly towards the West, the present ratio in the distribution of copies of First Folio will not be long maintained. Thirty-two of the British copies are in public institutions, and in their case the likelihood of further change of ownership is small. But one can predicate no fixity of tenure of the larger number of seventy-four copies which still remain in private hands on this side of the Atlantic. Probably half of these are destined during the next generation to adorn the shelves of private collectors in America. Somewhere about 1915 America and Great Britain will in all likelihood each own the same number of copies—some eighty-three apiece. No diminution of the American demand during the next quarter of a century looks probable at the moment. The chances are that at the close of that epoch the existing rates of American and British copies, sixty-one to one hundred and six, will be exactly reversed.

SIDNEY LEE.

IMPRESAS.

IN an article contributed to the 'Times' of the 27th of last December Mr. Sidney Lee announced the discovery of a new and interesting mention of Shakespeare in the household books of the Duke of Rutland at Belvoir Castle. It appears that in 1613 Thomas Screvin, steward of Francis, sixth Earl of Rutland, made the following entry under the general heading of 'Paymentes for howshold stuff, plate, armour, hammers, anvyles, and reparacions':

'Item, 31 Martii, to Mr. Shakespeare in gold about my Lord's impreso xliiij s; to Richard Burbage for paynting and making yt, in gold xliiij s—iiiij li. viij s.'

This 'impreso,' or more correctly 'impresa,' which we may define for the moment as a device or emblem with a motto, was invented, or possibly selected to grace the first appearance of the Earl at the annual tilting match held at Whitehall on the 'King's Day,' *i.e.*, the 24th of March, the anniversary of King James's accession, but unfortunately no description of it appears to have come down to us.

Mr. Lee discourses with his usual excellence about all that is known, or can at present be con-

jectured, respecting the circumstances under which Shakespeare and Burbage undertook this work, pointing out the friendship between the Earls of Rutland and Southampton, and the probability that Shakespeare was also known at Belvoir, through the dowager Countess of Rutland, a daughter of Sir Philip Sidney. But he seems to feel rather sad at the thought that Shakespeare should have wasted his time and energy on such a trivial matter as an *impresa*. Doubtless in the seventeenth century this 'futile fashion' of having an *impresa* deserves the harsh words which Mr. Lee showers unsparingly upon it, and may perhaps be compared to the assumption of crests and mottoes in our own day. From his point of view it is 'a foolish rage of which the beginnings are traced to Imperial Rome,' but a more extended investigation will show that the *impresa* is of much higher antiquity, and is associated with classical authors of whom not even Shakespeare need be ashamed.

Before quoting these ancient writers it will be well to give the definition of a true *impresa* from the earliest modern writer on the subject, Paolo Giovio. In his work, entitled, '*Dialogo dell' Imprese Militare et Amoroze*,' Rome, 1555, Giovio says that a true *impresa* consists of two parts, the device or emblem which is called the body, and the motto which is called the soul, and that the one should be complementary to the other, so that neither should have a perfectly evident meaning without the other. It is this combination of body and soul, symbolical in itself, that so much attracted cultivated minds in the sixteenth and seventeenth

centuries, and caused numbers of Italian dilettanti to collect impresas, and many to write about them as well. Among the number was the poet Tasso, whose dialogue was printed at Naples; it is now of extreme rarity, and no copy appears to exist in England. The mediaeval knight had no impresa in the strict sense of the word, but merely a device or badge, for it was not until the revival of learning and the study of the Greek dramatists that the real impresa was discovered. And here, as so often happens, the first is among the best. In the 'Seven against Thebes' of Aeschylus, written about five centuries before the Christian era, the hero Capaneus is described as bearing on his shield the device of Prometheus carrying a torch, with the motto, *πρήσω πόλιν*, 'I will burn down the city.' Now here we have an example of a true impresa. The figure of Prometheus is a splendid emblem and might convey many noble significations, but the motto at once determined the impresa or enterprise which the hero had undertaken. And be it noted that the motto of a true impresa should not exceed three words. But the impresa of Tydeus has an even more direct bearing upon the modern revival, especially when it is remembered that the early Italian writers say that impresas should have a handsome character, and that the ground on which the principal emblem is placed should be filled with appropriate ornament. To quote from Paley's translation: 'On the outside of his shield he bears this arrogant device, a sky wrought on it all blazing with stars; but a bright full moon in the centre of the shield, the queen of stars, the eye of night,

shines conspicuous.' This *impresa* is intentionally left without a motto to enable Eteocles in his answer to turn the device against the enemy: 'As for this night, which you say is pictured on his shield glittering with stars in the sky, it may perchance become prophetic to him by a special meaning. For if night should fall upon his eyes in death, then indeed to the bearer of it this arrogant device would rightly and justly sustain its own name.' The *impresas* of the other chiefs are also given, and it is at once evident that they were in no case family badges, nor were they supposed to be designed by the warriors who bore them; for when describing the device on the shield of Hippomedon the Messenger says: 'the designer, whoever he was, proved himself to be no common artist.' A good *Impresa*, therefore, was as much sought after and as highly prized in ancient Greece as in the Italy of the cinquecento or the England of King James I.

Turning now to the 'Phoenician Virgins' of Euripides we find that the seven chiefs have *impresas*, but not identical with those in Aeschylus, and the entire absence of mottoes necessitates lengthy explanations, and therefore weakens the general effect. For instance the *impresa* of Capaneus is described as 'an earthborn giant carrying on his shoulders a whole city, having by main force torn it up with levers—an intimation to us what our city should suffer.'

The light in which *impresas* were regarded at the period of their revival is nowhere better shown than in the preface of Giovanni Ferro to his monu-

mental folio, the 'Teatro d'Imprese, Venice, 1623.' He begins: 'The subject of Impresas is usually considered very difficult, and is perhaps the most difficult that can be discussed. For Giovio says that it is not in our power even after long reflection to find a device worthy of a given motto, and worthy at the same time of the patron who is to bear it, and of the author who invents it; wherefore, he says, that to compose impresas is the lucky chance of the inventive mind, and that the learned stake their honour and reputation in making them. Taegio confirms this opinion, and adds, that to make an Impresa complete and perfect in every respect is a matter of such difficulty that he regards it as almost impossible. And Annibale Caro, writing to the Duchess of Urbino, says that Impresas are things which are not found by means of books, and are not easily made even with the help of the imagination. Ruscelli affirms that of all the Impresas mentioned by Giovio three-fourths are worthless. The same might be said of those which he himself collected.'

So the doctors disagreed as usual even about impresas! Ferro goes on to observe that the difficulty is not so much due to the subject itself as to the multitude of symbols, differing very slightly and easily mistaken the one for the other. The works of the numerous writers who preceded Ferro in the same field are, as he justly says, almost all very incomplete, ill-arranged, and without indexes. Luca Contile alone, whose book, 'Ragionamenti sopra la proprietà delle Imprese,' was published in 1573, at all approaches Ferro either in wealth of

material or in orderly disposition, but his work is a thin folio of under two hundred leaves, while Ferro's volume has nearly four times as many. Added to this, Ferro published a second folio about as large as Contile's containing his reply to his critics. Contile, however, makes up in enthusiasm for anything and everything that he may lack in other respects. In his eyes the *Impresa* is one of the most noble and excellent things in the world, but he lets his zeal outrun his discretion when he attempts to prove that the Almighty himself invented the first *impresas*! The examples he adduces in support of his argument are the tree of knowledge of good and evil with the motto 'Ne comedes,' and the rainbow with the motto 'Nequaquam ultra interficietur omnis caro aquis.' Judged by the standard rules above mentioned, these are by no means perfect specimens, for the body is in one place and the soul in another, unless we are to suppose that the tree was duly labelled and that the rainbow originally bore an inscription. Of the *Impresa* as a human institution, Jason is claimed to be the founder, but as we have already seen, its pedigree is sufficiently good without these flights of fancy.

It is a curious fact that *impresas* appear to have been revived and to have come into their fullest vogue just as the best occasions for using them were passing away. In the sixteenth century the tournament was already degenerating into running at the ring, and lance thrusts were being exchanged across barriers that precluded all possibility of fighting at close quarters. In fact, the time was ripen-

VII.

L

ing for the immortal work of Cervantes, who, it will be remembered, represents Don Quixote as considering himself bound by the laws of chivalry to bear white armour 'without an *impresa* on his shield until he should gain one by his prowess.'

The subject of *impresas* in England has been so fully dealt with by Mr. Sidney Lee in his above-mentioned article in 'The Times,' and also by Mr. Pollard, from a more bibliographical standpoint, in 'Country Life' of 13th January, that there is little to add, save that in the play of 'Pericles,' though not in the portion recognized as Shakespeare's, there are no less than six *impresas*. The passage is in Act II, Scene 2, where the knights pass before Simonides while his daughter describes them to him:

Sim. Who is the first that doth prefer himself?

Thaisa. A knight of Sparta, my renowned father;
And the device he bears upon his shield
Is a black Æthiop, reaching at the sun;
The word, *Lux tua vita mihi*.

Sim. He loves you well, that holds his life of you.
Who is the second, that presents himself?

Thaisa. A prince of Macedon, my royal father;
And the device he bears upon his shield
Is an arm'd knight, that's conquer'd by a lady:
The motto thus, in Spanish, *Piu per dulçura que per fuerça*.

Sim. And what's the third?

Thaisa. The third, of Antioch;
And his device a wreath of chivalry;
The word, *Me pompae provexit apex*.

Sim. What is the fourth?

Thaisa. A burning torch, that's turned upside down;
The word, *Quod me alit, me extinguit*.

Sim. Which shows that beauty hath his power and will,
Which can as well inflame, as it can kill.

Thaisa. The fifth, an hand environed with clouds;
Holding out gold, that's by the touchstone tried;
The motto thus, *Sic spectanda fides*.

Sim. And what's the sixth and last, which the knight
himself
With such a graceful courtesy deliver'd?

Thaisa. He seems a stranger; but his present is
A wither'd branch, that's only green at top;
The motto, *In hac spe vivo*.

The third, fourth, and fifth, which are good impresas, are found in 'The Heroicall Devices of M. Claudius Paradin. Translated by P. S. London, W. Kearney, 1591.' The others are very poor and were probably the work of George Wilkins, to whom Mr. Lee, in the preface to his handsome reprint of the first edition of 'Pericles, 1609,' published last year, attributes all the play, except the greater part of Acts III and V, and some portions of Act IV. These impresas also occur in Wilkins's novel, 'The Painfull Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre,' published in 1608, the year before the appearance of the play.

As specimens of interesting historical impresas, we may mention the magnificent one of Charles I of Spain (the Emperor Charles V), viz., the Pillars of Hercules, with the motto 'Plus ultra,' in allusion to the extension of discovery and conquest in the New World; and the Gordian Knot and Sword of Ferdinand of Castile with the motto 'Tanto monta,' in allusion to his settlement of family disputes about the succession to the crown by appeal

to the Sword. It gives one rather a shock to read that in the sixteenth century the *impresa* of Silvestro Bottigella of Pavia was a *pianolo*, with the singularly appropriate motto, 'Tuerto y derecho lo igual' (crooked and straight, I make even), until one remembers that *pianola* is old Italian for *pialla*, a carpenter's plane.

And here we take our leave of these devices, suggesting for their own *impresa* a Lumber Room, with the motto, 'Non sine gloria.'

G. F. BARWICK.

THE PRINTERS OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS AND POEMS.

THE men who, during Shakespeare's lifetime, printed his 'Venus and Adonis,' 'Lucrece,' and 'Sonnets,' and the Quarto editions of his plays, can hardly be called Shakespeare's printers, since, with one exception, there is no evidence that he ever authorized the printing of any of his works, or ever revised those that were published. Even in the case of Richard Field, the evidence is presumptive and not direct. Yet Englishmen may be pardoned if they cling to the belief that Shakespeare employed Field to print for him and frequented the printing office in Blackfriars while the proof sheets of 'Venus and Adonis' and 'Lucrece' were passing through the press. For Stratford-on-Avon claimed both the printer and the poet, and if it be a stretch of the imagination to look upon them as fellow scholars in the grammar school, and playmates in the fields, their distant Warwickshire birthplace offered a bond of sympathy which might well draw them to one another.

It is some matter for congratulation that the first of Shakespeare's writings to be printed came from a press that had long been known for the excellence of its work. When Richard Field came to London in 1579, he entered the service of a bookseller, but

within a year he was transferred, probably at his own desire, to the printing office of Thomas Vautrollier, the Huguenot printer in Blackfriars. He could not have found a better school. Vautrollier's office was stocked with a varied assortment of letter, so that he was capable of printing anything from a folio downwards. His type was also kept in good condition, and his workmen were skilled and competent. To this business Field succeeded, on the death of Vautrollier in 1587, by the simple expedient of marrying the widow.

It was on the 18th April, 1593, a few days before the twenty-ninth anniversary of Shakespeare's birth, that Richard Field entered in the Registers of the Company of Stationers 'a booke intituled Venus and Adonis.' It appeared as a quarto of twenty-seven leaves, and bore on the title-page one of the smaller of the anchor devices which had formerly belonged to Vautrollier. The imprint stated that the work was to be sold at the 'white greyhound' in St. Paul's Churchyard, the address of John Harrison the elder, to whom Richard Field transferred his copyright in the poem in the following year (1594) and for whom he printed a second edition in that year, differing in nothing but the type. John Harrison the elder also entrusted to Field's press in 1594 the manuscript of 'The ravyshment of Lucrece.' This was issued as a quarto, with the simple title of 'Lucrece,' and differed little in appearance from the two editions of 'Venus and Adonis.' A larger and better type was used in the text, and a larger form of the anchor device was placed on the title-page. Harrison's name was also mentioned in

the imprint. A comparison of the several copies of 'Lucrece' show that it was corrected while passing through the press, and it is a pardonable though unwarranted belief that these corrections were made by Shakespeare. Richard Field printed a third edition of 'Venus and Adonis' for John Harrison the elder, in octavo, in 1596, and with that his connection with the dramatist's work ended, though he continued in business until his death in 1624, and rose to the highest position in his guild. As a printer he does not seem to have been so skilful or so careful as Thomas Vautrollier, yet, if we could wish these poems of Shakespeare better printed, judged by the standard of those days, Field had no cause to be ashamed of them.

A very different story has to be told in dealing with the printing of Shakespeare's plays. Pick up what one you will and its distinctive features will probably be bad paper, wretched type, and careless and slovenly press-work. This was largely due to the low condition to which the printing trade had been reduced by the monopoly system, which put all the best paying work into the hands of half a dozen men, while the majority of the printers, whose numbers were increasing year by year, found it nearly impossible to make a living by their trade.¹ The printers were thus compelled to seek work that was out of the reach of the monopolists. Of such a nature were plays, and one can almost picture

¹ One of the worst of these monopolies and one of which we shall hear more, was that which prevented all but a select few from printing the 'Grammar' and 'Accidence,' two school books that were in constant demand.

a crowd of hungry publishers and printers haunting the theatres and worrying authors, managers, and actors for any sort of copy of the piece which was then holding the boards. As showing the class of men to whom we owe the printed editions of Shakespeare's plays, it may be stated that not one of them ever rose to any high position in the Company to which they belonged. They were chiefly distinguished for their unruly behaviour and disregard of Royal proclamations and Star Chamber decrees.

The first play of Shakespeare's that appeared in print was the tragedy of 'Titus Andronicus.' This came from the press of JOHN DANTER, a printer in a small way of business in Duck Lane near Smithfield. Danter's life was a short and troubled one. The son of an Oxfordshire man, he came to London and entered the service of the great printer John Day, in March, 1582, being bound apprentice for eight years; but before half that term was out he was found helping to print the 'Grammar' and 'Accidence' at a secret press, and so serious a view did the Wardens of the Stationers' Company take of his offence that they disabled him from ever becoming a master printer. A year or two later the severity of this sentence was relaxed, the Court of Assistants admitting the offender into partnership with William Hoskins and Henry Chettle, with whom he shared premises in Fleet Street. The partnership was of short duration, and in 1592 Danter began printing on his own account. On the 6th February, 159 $\frac{3}{4}$, he entered in the registers 'a booke intituled A Noble Roman Historye of Tytus An-

dronicus.' Until last year no edition of so early a date had been seen since the time of Langbaine, and the entry was supposed to relate to a non-Shakespearean play. But in 1905 a Swedish gentleman discovered amongst his books a quarto of this play, with the imprint, 'London, Printed by John Danter, and are to be sold by Edward White and Thomas Millington, at the little North door of Paules at the signe of the Gunne 1594.' This unique quarto was sold to an American collector, it is said, for £2,000.

Three years later John Danter also printed 'An excellent conceited Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet,' and never was a masterpiece ushered into the world in a worse manner. The printer started with a type which, in spite of its worn condition, was fairly readable, but before he had half finished the work, he substituted a very much smaller and even more worn fount. The compositors' work was of the worst description, reversed letters and mis-readings being sprinkled over every page. And with this we part thankfully with John Danter. He disappears in a whirlwind of official indignation and Star Chamber shrieks for daring to print those sacred volumes, the 'Grammar' and 'Accidence,' and in less than three years afterwards he died.

The next printer with whom we are concerned is another Oxfordshire man, VALENTINE SIMMES or Symmes, to whose press we are known to owe the first quartos of 'Richard the Second' (1597), and 'Richard the Third' (1597), 'The Second Part of Henry IV' (1600), the first quarto of 'Much Ado about Nothing' (1600), as well as the third quarto of the 'First Part of Henry IV' in 1604. Simmes,

on his arrival in London in 1576, became an apprentice to a bookseller named Henry Sutton, who dealt largely in service books. But his desire being to be a printer and not a bookseller, he transferred his services to Henry Bynneman, a printer in Knightrider Street, who shared with John Day the patronage of Archbishop Parker. Bynneman died in 1584, and Simmes became a freeman of his Company in the next year. Apparently he found some difficulty in obtaining work, for the next that is heard of him is in connection with the Martin Marprelate press, for which he acted as compositor. He was arrested, with others, in 1589, brought to London, and thrown into the Tower. Five years later, *i.e.*, in 1594, he is found with a printing office of his own at the sign of the White Swan in Addle or Addling Hill, one of the narrow lanes running up from the river Thames near Baynard's Castle. Simmes had been trained in a good school, and even his Shakespeare quartos bear evidence of the fact; indeed, the first quarto of 'Much Ado about Nothing' is one of the few play-books of that period that were decently printed. On the other hand, as the editors of the Cambridge Shakespeare were the first to point out, in some copies of the quarto of the 'Second Part of Henry IV' the first scene of Act III was entirely omitted. The mistake was discovered before the whole impression was printed, and the missing scene inserted on two new leaves. In order to do this the type of part of the preceding and subsequent leaves was distributed, so that there are two different impressions for the latter part of Act II and the beginning of Act III, Scene 2.

In 1595 Simmes was caught printing the 'Grammar' and 'Accidence,' and his press was seized and his type melted. He was in trouble again in 1598 for disorderly printing, and after a chequered career the last heard of him is in the year 1622, when by an order of the High Commissioners he was prohibited from working as a master printer, and was allowed a pension of £4 a year by the Company of Stationers.

A press of a much more interesting character is that of THOMAS CREED, who carried on business at the sign of the Catherine Wheel in Thames Street. Thomas Creed's birthplace is unknown, but he was apprenticed to Thomas East, a printer chiefly remembered for his musical publications, and by East he was made a freeman on the 7th October, 1578. Some years more elapsed before he began printing for himself, and it is not until the year 1593 that his first book-entry occurs in the registers. His office was stocked with a varied assortment of letter, most of it in good condition, and his workmanship was superior to that of many of his contemporaries. Hence we are not surprised to find amongst his earliest patrons, the great Elizabethan publisher, William Ponsonby, who endeavoured as far as possible to produce good books in a good style, and for whom Creed printed amongst other things Robert Greene's 'Mammilia,' Macchiavelli's 'Florentine History,' and Edmund Spenser's 'Colin Clout's come home again.' Indeed, much of the best of Elizabethan literature came from his press.

But it is with Creed's Shakespeare work that

we are more particularly concerned. In 1594 he entered in the register of the Stationers' Company, and printed shortly afterwards, three books which have more than passing interest for Shakespeare students. These were 'The First Part of the Contention betwixt the two famous houses of York and Lancaster,' 'The True Tragedie of Richard the Third,' and 'The Famous Victories of Henry V.' The first of these was the old play upon which Shakespeare founded 'The Second Part of King Henry VI.' This quarto bore on the title-page the printer's well-known device of Truth crowned, but stript and being beaten with a scourge held by a hand issuing from the clouds. This is repeated on the last leaf with a colophon beneath it. Except for irregular casting the type used in printing this is above the average, whilst the arrangement of the title-page was distinctly good. 'The True Tragedie of Richard the Third' was printed for William Barley, probably from the acting copy used by the 'Queenes Majesties players.' The third play, 'The Famous Victories of Henry V'—the entry of it stands in the registers next to that of 'Lucrece'—had also belonged to the Queen's players. This was the original upon which Shakespeare drew for the first and second parts of 'Henry IV,' and the play of 'Henry V.' Nineteen years after the first known edition (1598), another appeared in 1617, printed by Creed's successor, Bernard Alsop, for Timothy Barlow.

In 1595 Creed entered and printed apparently on his own account, 'The Lamentable Tragedie of Locrine, Newly set forth, overseene and cor-

rected by W. S.,' no doubt thinking that the initials would find it a ready sale, until some one troubled to point out that Shakespeare had nothing to do with it.

Creed's first genuine Shakespeare quarto was the second edition of 'Richard III,' which he printed for Andrew Wise in 1598. In the next year (1599) the second quarto of 'Romeo and Juliet' came from his press at the instance of Cuthbert Burby, its lawful owner, and in 1600 he put to press for Thomas Millington and John Busby 'The chronicle history of Henry the fift.' The first quarto of 'The Merry Wives of Windsor,' the second quarto of 'Henry V,' and the third quarto of 'Richard III,' all came from his press in 1602, and from that time onwards till 1612, he continued to print editions of both 'Richard III' and 'Henry V.' Good workman as he could be when he liked, most of these quartos of Creed's are very little better than those issued by his brother printers. In 1616 he took into partnership Bernard Alsop, who in the following year succeeded to the business on the retirement or death of Creed.

The same year that saw the publication of 'Lucrece' and the three non-Shakespearean plays just noticed, and about the same time—that is, in May, 1594—another printer, named PETER SHORT, entered in the Register a play called 'A merrie conceyted comedie of the Taming of a Shrew.' This entry is held to relate to an older play dealing with the same subject, and at present Peter Short's connection with Shakespeare's work is limited to the first quarto of 'The First Part of Henry IV,' printed

158 PRINTERS OF SHAKESPEARE'S

by him for Andrew Wise in 1598. The general appearance of this book is good. The title-page is neatly arranged and printed with fairly regular founts of roman and italic, while above the imprint is the printer's device of the star. The type of the text is also much clearer, and the workmanship above the average. But although this was the only work of Shakespeare's ever put into Short's hands, he was the printer of that famous Elizabethan notebook, Francis Mere's '*Palladis Tamia*,' renowned for its Shakespeare allusions. This dumpy little octavo is also printed throughout in a clear and regular fount of roman. The printer's history may be briefly outlined. Admitted a freeman of the Company of Stationers in 1589, Short succeeded to the printing business of Henry Denham, whose device of the star he adopted as his sign when he set up his printing office in Bread Street Hill, near St. Paul's. From the fact of his name appearing in a list of printing houses, upon which the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London directed that watch should be kept for prohibited books, it would seem that Short, like many of his brother printers, was given to illicit printing. In addition to the two books noticed above, several notable works came from his press, including a number of musical publications. He died in 1603, probably from the plague, which was very deadly in London in that year, and his business passed into the hands of Humphrey Lownes.

Another Shakespeare issue of the year 1598 was '*Love's Labour's Lost*,' printed by 'W. W. for

Cuthbert Burby.' The initials stand for WILLIAM WHITE, a small printer then living in Smithfield, whose principal trade lay in ballads and broadsides, and who was fined five shillings on one occasion for printing a lewd ballad called 'The Wife of Bath.' This quarto of 'Love's Labour's Lost' may be taken as a fair specimen of his work, which was about as bad as it could be. His initials are also found on the title-page of the second quarto of 'The True Tragedie of Richard, Duke of York,' otherwise 'The Third Part of King Henry VI,' which he printed for Thomas Millington in 1600, and again in the fifth quarto of 'The First Part of Henry IV,' printed in 1613 for Mathew Law.

The second quarto of this same play, which was issued in 1599, introduces us to SIMON STAFFORD, whose initials, S. S., are in the imprint as printer for Andrew Wise. A chapter might well be written about this man's history. He belonged to the guild of Drapers, but choosing to be a printer, was apprenticed to Christopher Barker, the royal printer, who was also a member of the Drapers' Company. Stafford set up a press in Black Raven Alley, in the parish of St. Peter's, Cornhill, in 1597, but on the 13th March, 1598, the Stationers seized his press and letters, declaring that they had found 4,000 copies of the 'Grammar' and 'Accidence' on his premises. Stafford's offence was aggravated by his being a draper, and it was not until he transferred himself to the Company of Stationers that he was allowed to carry on the trade of a printer. In addition to the quarto of 'Henry IV,' he also printed the 1611 edition of 'Pericles.'

None of the presses that have been noticed, not even that of Thomas Creed, equals in interest that which next comes under consideration—the press of JAMES ROBERTS. We are undoubtedly indebted to it for the first quartos of ‘A Midsummer Night’s Dream’ and ‘The Merchant of Venice,’ the second quarto of ‘Titus Andronicus,’ all three printed by him in 1600, and also for the second and third quartos of the tragedy of ‘Hamlet,’ printed in the years 1604 and 1605. Admitted a freeman of the Company of Stationers in 1564, Roberts seems to have set up in Fleet Street under the sign of ‘Love and Death,’ and for some years devoted himself mainly to the printing of ballads. He then joined partnership with a certain Richard Watkins, and they obtained a royal patent for the sole printing of almanacs and prognostications, which must have been a very lucrative business. In 1593 Roberts married the widow of John Charlwood, a printer at the sign of the Half Eagle and Key in the Barbican. Charlwood appears to have had a large stock of type, blocks, and devices, to which Roberts afterwards added considerably. Charlwood’s copyrights also were numerous, though chiefly of a theological character. Roberts seems to have launched out in an entirely new direction, and within the next twelve years printed works by Nicholas Breton, Daniel, Drayton, Gabriel Harvey, Lyly, Marston, Nash, Spenser, and Shakespeare. Which of the three Shakespeare quartos printed by Roberts in the year 1600 is the earliest it would be rash to say, as the ‘Titus Andronicus’ had been entered in the Registers on the appearance of the first edition in

1594. There were also two issues of each of the other plays, both bearing different imprints. One quarto of the 'Midsummer Night's Dream' has no printer's name, but simply the statement that it was printed 'for Thomas Fisher,' but there is no doubt that both were printed by Roberts. In the same way there were two quartos of 'The Merchant of Venice,' one the outcome of the licence granted to Roberts on 22nd July, 1598, and the other following upon his transfer of the copyright to 'Thomas Haies.' On the title-page of the Roberts quarto of the 'Merchant' is seen the device of Richard Johnes, another London printer of this date, and at the end of it the tail-piece of the woman's head and cornucopiae, which certainly once belonged to Richard Field, and is found in his books up to this period. How and when it came into the hands of James Roberts are questions that need further investigation, but cannot be dealt with here. The 'Fisher' edition of the 'Midsummer Night's Dream' has that publisher's device of the kingfisher on the title-page, and the ornament at the end tells us nothing; whereas the Roberts copy has Charlwood's old block of the Half Eagle and Key above the imprint. The points in common between the two are the ornament or band at the head of the first page of the text and the similar type.

In or about 1608—the exact date is unknown—James Roberts sold his business to William Jagard, who, until this time, had been trading as a bookseller in the Churchyard of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, and who now added that of a printer to

his business. Jaggard's connection, and that of his son Isaac, with the First Folio of 1623 has been so often described that there is no need to repeat it here.

The only other hitherto recognized printer of the first edition of any work by Shakespeare during his life is GEORGE ELD, from whose press, in 1609, came the 'Sonnets' and 'Troilus and Cressida.' Eld was a Derbyshire man, who in 1593 had put himself apprentice to a stationer for eight years, but was admitted a freeman of the Company two years before the expiration of his time, a most unusual proceeding. He was a capable printer, many of his books being amongst the best specimens of typography of the Elizabethan time. To name only one example, 'Grimstone's General Historie of the Netherlands' is a very handsome folio in which the types and presswork are exceedingly good. Unfortunately the same cannot be said for the 'Sonnets,' which was marred by being printed in a diminutive fount of roman that did not print well, nor was the quarto of 'Troilus and Cressida' a much better performance.

In 1614 Eld took into partnership Miles Flesher or Fletcher, and in the return made in the following year they were found to have two presses, an evidence that they had an extensive business. Eld died of the plague in 1624, and was succeeded by his partner.

Having thus passed in review the printers whose names or initials are found in the imprints of the early Shakespeare quartos, I propose to say a few words as to the presses to which the editions without im-

prints may be assigned. The first of these is the maimed and mutilated first quarto of 'HAMLET.' Only the publishers' names—Nicholas Ling and John Trundle—are given on the title-page, and the device which decorates it is that of Ling. The type is not good, and the press work supports the theory that the book was hastily rushed through the press. The ornament at the top of the first page of text is one used by Valentine Simmes, but I was nevertheless at first inclined to attribute the edition to the press of Roberts, to whom the play had been licensed the previous year, and who seems to have been fond of acquiring ornaments which had been used by other printers. Mr. Pollard, however, who had been independently investigating the question as to the printing of the play, produced me a book, the 'Earl of Gowrie's Conspiracy,' printed by Simmes in 1603, in which this particular ornament occurred, and to the press of Simmes the first edition of 'Hamlet' must therefore be assigned.

We may next consider to whose typography we owe the two quartos of 'KING LEAR,' which appeared in 1608, both without any indication of the printer. In one the imprint is simply 'Printed for Nathaniel Butter 1608,' while in the other it takes the longer form, 'London, Printed for Nathaniel Butter, and are to be sold at his shop in Paul's Church-yard at the signe of the Pide Bull neere St. Austin's Gate, 1608.' The first-named issue has on the title-page above the imprint the device of Richard Johnes, and at the top of A2 a woodcut ornament, both of which identify it as coming from the press of James Roberts, though whether in 1600

Roberts was still the owner of it we cannot be quite sure. The Pide Bull issue is not so easily identified. The most obvious available clue is the curious device above the imprint of a rod, round which two snakes are wound, and which is fitted with wings at the top and bottom, held at the bottom by two hands issuing from clouds. Cornucopiae also form a part of the design, which is surmounted by a winged horse. This device had come from abroad, having once belonged to Andreas Wechelin of Frankfort, and was used by him in printing '*Petri Rami commentariorum de religione Christiana libri quatuor 1576*,' the title-page of which is amongst those collected by Ames (B.M. 463, h. 8, 461). In 1600, this device is found in an English book, William Covell's *Brief Answer unto Certaine Reasons by way of an Apologie delivered to . . . the . . . bishop of Lincolne by Mr. Iohn Burges . . .* with the imprint 'At London Printed by G. S. for Clement Knight, and are to be sold at his shop in Pauls Churchyard at the signe of the Holy Lambe. 1606.'

It will further be noticed that the Pide Bull copy has at the top of sig. B a narrow band of conventional pattern, with a man's face in the centre, which will be found again at the top of the title-page of the English translation of William Bucanus' '*Institutions of Christian Religion*,' printed at London, by George Snowdon and Leonell Snowdon in 1606 (B.M. 874, e 10);¹ while on sig. A3 of the '*Briefe Answer*' will be found a large pierced

¹ There is a better impression of this title-page amongst the Ames collection.

woodcut initial letter, which is used more than once in the Institutions (*see* Kk₃ recto, Mm verso).

But who were George and Leonell Snowden? According to the Registers, George Snowden was entered as an apprentice to Robert Robinson on the 27th April, 1590; but this entry has a marginal note that George was Singleton's apprentice and that Robinson was to 'put him away' within seven days, an order he does not seem to have obeyed, as George Snowden was presented by him for his freedom on the 11th May, 1597. Leonell or Lionell Snowden was evidently a relative, but not a brother of George's. He, too, was an apprentice to Robinson, being out of his time in February, 1604. Some time in 1606, the year of the publication of the 'Brief Answer' and 'Institutions' the two Snowdens appear to have had an interest for a short time in a printing business of John Harrison the youngest who died in 1604, and who in his turn had succeeded to the business of Thomas Judson. In Sir John Lambe's memoranda, printed in Vol. III of the 'Transcript' (pp. 669, *et seq.*), either Mr. Arber has made a mistake in transcribing the names, or Sir John Lambe got confused, as well he might, between the Snowdens and the Snodhams. In any case their career was a very short one, and there is not a single book entered to either of them in the Registers.

Further, according to these same memoranda of Sir John Lambe's, the Snowdens, in 1608, the year of the publication of 'King Lear,' transferred their business to Nicholas Oakes or Okes. Now Nicholas Okes had taken up his freedom in 1603, and his first book entry in the Registers was in July, 1607.

It is quite possible that the 'Lear,' though it bears the date of 1608, may have been printed towards the close of 1607, while on the other hand though Okes had permission to print in July, 1607, he may not have bought the Snowden's interest until 1608. The actual hand that printed it matters little, we now know that it came from the office established by Thomas Judson in 1586, and in the hands successively of John Harrison the younger, George and Lionel Snowden, and Nicholas Okes.

A third play, the first quarto of which appeared without any hint as to the printer, was 'Pericles,' two editions of which were printed in 1609 'for' Henry Gosson, who was 'then living at the sign of the Sunne in Paternoster Row.' Both of them bear at the top of the first page of text a band easily recognized as that of William White, whose business was taken over in 1620 by Augustine Matthews, the printer of the second quarto of 'Othello' in 1630 for Richard Hawkins, in which the same band is used again, and White's block of the charioteer in a very worn state is seen on the title-page.

With this attempt to identify the typographical authors of these three plays we may bid farewell to the printers of Shakespeare's plays and poems. Greatly would these good men have been surprised had they been told that their connection with these sixpenny pamphlets would be their chief title to remembrance.

H. R. PLOMER.

SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE, 1901-1905.

THE first five years of the twentieth century have seen the commencement of no fewer than twenty-seven editions of Shakespeare's works, of which some still remain incomplete. Of ordinary modern editions the palm lies between the Edinburgh Folio, a fine library edition, edited successively by the late Mr. W. E. Henley and Professor Walter Raleigh, and published by Mr. Grant Richards, and the Shakespeare Head edition, produced by Messrs. A. H. Bullen and F. Sidgwick. This latter has the added merit of being the first printed at the poet's birthplace. Messrs. Methuen have also produced a charming pocket edition in forty volumes, which differs from most pocket editions in being really adapted to the pocket, and at the same time easily legible.

Of smaller collections and editions of single plays the name is legion, but most are designed for use in schools.

Textual and bibliographical study has been greatly advanced by the facsimile editions which have been produced. In 1902 was published the Clarendon Press First Folio, with a most exhaustive introduction and census of copies by Mr. Sidney Lee. In 1903 and 1904 Messrs. Methuen published their

facsimiles of the Third and Fourth Folios, and late in 1905 the Syndics of the Clarendon Press completed their design by issuing in five volumes the Shakespearean work omitted from the First Folio, *i.e.*, Venus and Adonis, Lucrece, the Sonnets, Pericles, and the Passionate Pilgrim.

Plays have been translated into French, German, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, and even Esperanto.

Of critical works, the crown easily goes to Professor Bradley's 'Shakespearean Tragedy,' especially to the two introductory lectures, which for breadth of view and depth of insight combined have few rivals in all the vast literature of the subject. Another piece of sympathetic criticism is Canon Beeching's contribution to the endless problem of the personalities involved in the Sonnets.

To the equally endless controversy over the Baconian authorship of the Plays, a great deal has been added. Among much wild criticism stand out the legal contributions, especially Mr. G. C. Bompas' 'The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays.'

German and American students have left few fields of research uninvestigated, but it cannot be said that knowledge of the poet has been thereby very much advanced.

An admirable feature of recent years is the amount of Elizabethan authors other than Shakespeare who have been reprinted, thus furnishing most necessary foundations for the study of Shakespeare, who was no *lusus naturae*, but as much the creation of his age and country as any other genius. These are not given below, but mention may be made of the series 'Materialien zur Kunde der

älteren englischen Dramas,' edited by Professor Bang, and containing work by many scholars or different nations, amongst others by Mr. W. W. Greg and Mr. R. B. McKerrow.

In compiling the following list, many books have been omitted as unprofitable. Notes have been added which will assist the reader to continue the process of elimination as far as he may desire. From consideration of space it has been found impossible to include magazine articles, and for a different reason works in Slavonic languages are also omitted.

TEXTS.

WORKS.

The Edinburgh Folio edition.
Edited successively by W. E. Henley and Walter Raleigh.
1901-4.

A fine library edition of the text, with the introductory matter of the First Folio.

The Windsor Shakespeare. 40 vols. 1901-3.

Edited with notes by H. N. Hudson.

The Works of Shakespeare. 1902.

A handsomely produced edition, with notes and unfortunate illustrations.

The Works of Shakespeare. Edited by W. J. Craig. 40 vols. 1903-5. 16°.

A very pretty pocket Shakespeare, the text being easily legible in spite of the size.

The Oxford Shakespeare. Edited by W. J. Craig. 1904.

A carefully edited text, with a glossary.

The Student's Shakespeare. 1902, etc.

Edited by A. W. Verity.

The Elizabethan Shakespeare. Edited, with notes, etc., by M. H. Liddell. 1903, etc.

The text is surrounded by a grammatical commentary. So far only Macbeth has appeared.

The King's Shakespeare. 1904, etc.

At present the Sonnets only have appeared, with an introduction by Mrs. Stopes.

The Shakespeare Head Edition. Stratford-on-Avon, 1904, etc.

The first edition of Shakespeare printed in his native place. Produced by Messrs. A. H. Bullen and F. Sidgwick.

170 SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE.

WORKS—continued.

The Works of Shakespeare.
1905, etc.

In Methuen's Standard Library, edited by Sidney Lee.

EDITIONS IN FACSIMILE, ETC.

Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, etc.
1902.

The Clarendon Press facsimile of the First Folio. Photographically reproduced from the Duke of Devonshire's (formerly the Roxburghe) copy, and edited with an elaborate bibliographical introduction and a Census of 158 copies by Sidney Lee.

The National Shakespeare. A facsimile of the text of 1623. Illustrated. 3 vols. 1904.

Not really a facsimile, but a page for page reprint. Pre-tentious and bad.

Mr. William Shakespear's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, etc. 1905.

A facsimile of the Third Folio, produced by Messrs. Methuen.

Mr. William Shakespear's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, etc. 1904.

Messrs. Methuen's facsimile of the Fourth Folio, uniform with that of the Third.

[Venus and Adonis, Lucrece, the Sonnets, the Passionate Pilgrim, Pericles.] 5 vols. 1905.

The Clarendon Press photo-

graphic facsimiles. These five works, excluded from the First Folio, supplement the 1902 facsimile of that work. Edited by Sidney Lee, with a careful introduction and a census of copies to each volume. The copies chosen for reproduction are as follows: Venus and Adonis, Lucrece, Sonnets, and Pericles, Bodleian, Passionate Pilgrim, Britwell. These five quartos, with the Folio, form a most valuable basis for study, both in the text and the bibliography of Shakespeare.

The Works of William Shakespeare, according to the Orthography and arrangement of the more authentic quarto and folio versions. 1904, etc.

The "Old Spelling Shakespeare." Edited by Dr. Furnivall and published by Mr. Moring. At present Love's Labor Lost only has appeared.

SINGLE PLAYS OR POEMS.

From a large number of editions, many of which are designed for school use, the following have been selected:

The Sonnets of Shakespeare. With an introduction and notes by H. C. Beeching. 1904.

In the 'Athenæum Press Series.' The editor's sane and comprehensive introduction surveys the controversies raised by the Sonnets, and in particular controverts the theory that they

SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE. 171

were either instruments of adulation or literary exercises.

Sonnets. 1904.

A very pretty edition of the text, produced, for lovers of poetry rather than students, at the Astolat Press.

The Poems and Sonnets of Shakspeare. With an introduction by E. Dowden. 1903.

A Book of Shakespeare's Songs, with musical settings by various composers. The whole arranged and decorated by Edward Edwards. 1903.

Shakespeare's Songs, with drawings by H. Ospovat. 1901.

The Tempest. Illustrated by R. Anning Bell. 1901.

Marina: a dramatic romance. Being the Shakespearian portion of the tragedy of Pericles. Edited by S. Wellwood. 1902.

The same selection as that by Mr. F. G. Fleay in the 'New Shakspeare Society Transactions,' but adhering more closely to the original texts.

TRANSLATIONS.

Neue Shakespeare Bühne. Herausgeber: E. Pactel. 1903, etc.

Shakespeare dramen. ('Romeo und Julia,' 'Othello,' 'Lear,' 'Macbeth'). Nachgelassene Übersetzungen von O. Gildemeister, herausgegeben von Dr. H. Spies. 1904.

Vischer, Friedrich Theodor. Shakespeare-Vorträge.

The third, fourth and fifth volumes of this work contain German translations of the text and commentaries upon Othello, King Lear, King John, Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, Richard III, and Henry VIII.

Antonius en Cleopatra. Vertaling van Dr. E. B. Koster. [1904.]

Antoine et Cléopâtre: traduit en vers français. 1904.

The translator, M. Léon Morel, here follows up his versions of Macbeth and Henry VIII.

Hamlet. . . . Refundido y adaptado á la escena española por L. Lopez-Ballesteros y F. Gonzalez Llana. 1903.

Julius Cäsar. . . . mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen versehen von J. Resch. 1905.

Le Roi Lear. Traduit de Shakespeare. 1904.

A prose translation by Pierre Loti and Emile Vedel.

Theâtre du Peuple, Bussany, Vosges. 8° spectacle, 1902.

La Tragédie de Macbeth de Shakespeare. Traduite par M. Pottecher. [1902.]

Macbeth. Traduction nouvelle et littérale, avec une préface et des notes, par C. Demblon. 1904.

Mácbeth. Adaptacion, . . . a la escena española, hecha directamente de inglés por J. de Elola. 1904.

172 SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE.

- TRANSLATIONS—*continued.*
 De Koopman van Venetië . . .
 Vertaling van Dr. E. B. Koster. [1904.]
 Othello. Texte critique avec la traduction en regard par A. Beljame. 1902.
M. Beljame published translations of Macbeth in 1897, and of Julius Caesar in 1899.
 — Othello. Traduzione di L. E. Tettoni. 1901.
 La Fierrecilla domada. Version castellana de A. de Vilasalba. 1904.
Vol. XV of the 'Teatro Antiguo y Moderno.'
 Les Deux Gentilshommes de Vérone. 1902.
A translation by M. Olivier.
 Hamleto, regido de Danujo. Tradukis L. Zamenhof. Paris, 1902.
A version in Esperanto.
 La Tentego de Shakespeare. Tradukita de Ach. Motteau. [1905.]
The Tempest. Also in Esperanto.
 Richepin, J. Falstaff. Pièce imitée de Shakespeare. 1904.

BIOGRAPHY.

- Hazlitt, W. C. Shakespeare. 1902.
A study of his private and literary life.
 Hessen, R. Das Leben Shakespeares. . . . 1904.
Popular, but carefully written.
 Lambert, D. Cartae Shakespeareanae. A chronological catalogue of extant evidence relating to the life and works of William Shakespeare. 1904.
 Lee, Sidney. Shakespeare's Career. 1904.
In the author's 'Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century.'
 Rolfe, W. J. A Life of William Shakespeare. 1905.
Controverses Mr. Lee's theory of the Sonnets, and deals at some length with the other poems.
 Corbin, J. A new Portrait of Shakespeare. The case of the Ely Palace painting. 1903.
Contends 'that the so-called Droeshout original is probably a fabrication, and the Ely painting a life-portrait of Shakespeare.'
 Elton, C. I. William Shakespeare, his Family and Friends. 1904.
Posthumously published essays towards an exhaustive life and criticism of Shakespeare, which was never completed.
 Emery, M. E. B. Was not

SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE. 173

Shakespeare a gentleman?
1903.

Contending that Shakespeare was of the family of Pembroke.

Gray, Joseph W. Shakespeare's marriage, his departure from Stratford, and other incidents in his life. 1905.

Stopes, Mrs. Charlotte C. Shakespeare's Family. 1901.

— The True Story of the Stratford Bust. A contem-

porary likeness of Shakespeare. 1904.

Reprinted from the 'Monthly Review.'

Yeatman, J. Pym. The Gentle Shakspeare. 1904.

Published by the 'Shakespeare Society of New York,' and proving to the satisfaction of the author that the poet was a Catholic, and wrote his own will.

CRITICISM.

Bradley, A. C. Shakesperean Tragedy. Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth. 1904.

An acute and suggestive analysis of Shakespeare's view of Tragic Life. The best critical work on Shakespeare recently produced.

Brooke, Stopford A. Ten Plays of Shakespeare. 1905.

The ten plays are: A Midsummer Night's Dream, Romeo and Juliet, Richard II, Richard III, The Merchant of Venice, As You Like it, Macbeth, Coriolanus, A Winter's Tale, The Tempest.

Campbell, Lewis. Tragic Drama in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Shakespeare. 1904.

A careful study of essentials in Tragedy as they appear in the Greek and English Drama.

Canning, the Hon. Albert. Shakespeare studied in eight plays. 1903.

A popular exposition of Troilus and Cressida, Timon of Athens, Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra, Richard III, Henry VIII, King Lear, and A Midsummer Night's Dream.

Collins, J. Churton. Studies in Shakespeare. 1904.

Chiefly remarkable for the essay on 'Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar, reprinted from the Fortnightly Review.

Eichhoff, Theodor. Shakespeare's Forderung einer absoluten Moral. 1902.

Commentaries, with the English text and a translation (by Emil Wagner) on Venus and Adonis and Lucrece: followed by essays on 'Shakespeare und die Mathematik' and 'Shakespeare's Ehe.' An attempt to define Shakespeare's personal views.

Eichhoff, Theodor. Unser

174 SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE.

- CRITICISM—continued.
- Shakespeare. Beiträge. 1903-1904.
Four parts, containing Essays on the Texts of Romeo and Juliet and the Comedy of Errors, an introduction to Shakespearean study, and an elaborate examination of the Sonnets.
- Engel, E. Shakespeare—Rätsel. 1904.
Seven papers, of no great importance, but reasonably and pleasantly written.
- Fleming, W. H. Shakespeare's Plots. 1902.
The Laws of dramatic construction illustrated from Macbeth, the Merchant of Venice, Julius Caesar, Twelfth Night and Othello.
- Gelber, A. An der Grenzen zweier Zeiten. 1902.
Papers on Shakespeare as a thinker and a humanist.
- Kohler, Professor J. Verbrecher-Typen in Shakespeare's Dramen. 1903.
The villainy of Shakespeare's villains is here carefully classified and pigeon-holed.
- Mauerhof, E. Shakespeare Probleme. 1905.
Three Essays: 'Lady Macbeth,' 'Briefe über Hamlet,' and 'Othello—die Tragödie der Eifersucht.'
- Moulton, R. G. The Moral System of Shakespeare. 1903.
- Opitz, H. William Shakespeare als Charakter-Dichter. 1902.
Hamlet, Lear, Othello.
- Sander, G. H. Das Moment det letzten Spannung in der englischen Tragödie bis zu Shakespeare. 1902.
- Sarrazin, G. Kleine Shakespeare Studien. 1902.
One of the 'Beiträge zur romanische und englische Philologie,' consisting of two papers on the Merry Wives of Windsor and the Lover's Complaint.
- Stubbs, C. W., Dean. The Christ of English Poetry. The Hulsean Lectures, 1904-1905. 1906.
Lecture III, deals with Shakespeare's attitude towards religion.
- Wolff, Max J. William Shakespeare. Studien und Aufsätze. 1903.
-
- Alfonso, N. R. d'. Lo Spiritismo secondo Shakespeare. 1905.
- Burgess, W. The Bible in Shakespeare. [1903.]
- Carter, T. Shakespeare and Holy Scripture, with the version he used. 1905.
Parallel passages, showing Shakespeare's familiarity with the Geneva Bible.
- Conrat, H. J. La Musica in Shakespeare. 1903.
From the Rivista Musicale Italiana.
- Douse, T. le M. Examination of an old Manuscript preserved in the Library of the

SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE. 175

- Duke of Northumberland, etc. 1904.
Discovered at Alnwick in 1867, and here attributed to the hand of John Davies, of Hereford.
- Elson, L. C. Shakespeare in Music. A collation of the chief musical allusions in the plays, etc. 1901.
- Franz, W., Professor. Die Grundzüge der Sprache Shakespeares. 1902.
- Green, B. E. Shakespeare and Goethe on Gresham's Law and the Single Gold Standard. [1902.]
- Hartmann, S. Shakespeare in Art. 1901.
- Holmesworthe, L. Shakespeare's Garden. 1903.
- Kühne, W. Venus, Amor and Bacchus in Shakespeare's Dramen. Ein medicinisch-poetische Studie. 1902.
- Lippmann, E. O. Von. Naturwissenschaftliches aus Shakespeare. 1902.
- Lucy, Margaret. Shakespeare and the Supernatural: a brief study of folklore, superstition, and witchcraft in 'Macbeth,' 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' and 'The Tempest.' 1906.
- Mantzius, Karl. Engelske Theaterforhold i Shakespeare-Tiden. 1901.
A dissertation on the London Stage in the time of Shakespeare. Part of the author's 'Skuespilkunstens Historie.'
- Mauntz, A. von. Heraldik in Diensten der Shakespeare-Forschung. 1903.
- Phin, J. The Shakespeare Cyclopaedia and New Glossary. 1902.
- Schulz, E. G. H. Das Verkleidungs-Motiv bei Shakespeare. 1904.
- Wilson, W. Shakespeare and Astrology. 1903.

CRITICISM ON SINGLE PLAYS, ETC.

- Gray, Robert. The True Hamlet of William Shakespeare. 1901.
- Chambers, D. L. The metre of Macbeth. 1903.
Places the date at about 1606. With a table for twenty-six plays.
- Porter, Charlotte, and Clarke, Helen A. Shakespeare Studies. Macbeth. 1901.
With extracts from Holinshed, Bellenden, Reginald Scot, and Golding's Ovid.
- Stasov, V. V. Über Shakespeares Kaufmann von Venedig und das Shylok-Problem. 1905.
A translation from the Russian.
- Leonetti, Raffaele. La Desdemona di Shakespeare. 1903.
- Acheson, A. Shakespeare and the Rival Poet . . . proving the identity of the patron and the rival of the Sonnets [with the Earl of Southampton and George Chapman]. 1903.
- Wilde, Oscar. The Portrait of Mr. W. H. 1901.

176 SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE.

CRITICISM ON SINGLE PLAYS, ETC.—continued.

Reprinted from 'Black-wood's' of July, 1889, by Mosher. A fanciful story, of great literary merit, urging that 'Mr. W. H.' was a young actor named Will Hughes.

M., J. Shakespeare self-revealed in his 'Sonnets' and 'Phoenix and Turtle.' The texts with an introduction and analyses by J. M. 1904.

Creighton, Dr. C. Shakespeare's Story of his Life. 1904.

An attempt to find autobiography in the Sonnets and the Tempest. In the former the Herbert theory is supported.

Jacobson, H. William Shakespeare und Käthchen Minola. 1903.

A study of The Taming of the Shrew.

Schomberg, E. H. The Taming of the Shrew. Eine Studie zu Shakesperes Kunst. 1904.

Hef 20 of 'Studien zur englischen Philologie.'

Robertson, J. M. Did Shakespeare write 'Titus Andronicus'? 1905.

The play is here taken from Shakespeare and given to Peele and Greene as authors or at least revisers.

HISTORY OF SHAKESPEARE CRITICISM, ETC.

Bobsin, O. Shakespeare's Othello in englischer Bühnenbearbeitung. 1904.

Brodmeier, C. Die Shakespeare Bühne nach den alten Bühnenanweisungen. 1904.

Burmeister, O. Nachdichtungen und Buehneneinrichtungen von Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice. 1902.

Cserwinka, J. Shakspeare und die Bühne. 1902.

Eichhoff, T. Der Weg zu Shakespeare. 1902.

Chiefly an exposure of forgeries by J. P. Collier. Reviewed in 'The Library.'

Hannmann, F. Dryden's tragödie 'All for Love or the World well Lost' und ihr Verhältnis zu Shakespeare's 'Antony and Cleopatra.' 1903.

Köppel, E. Studien über Shakespeare's Wirkung auf zeitgenössische Dramatiker. 1905.

Vol. 9 of the series 'Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas.'

Lounsbury, T. R. Shakespearean Wars. i. Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist. ii. Shakespeare and Voltaire. 2 vols. 1901.

'The Yale Bicentennial Publications.' A chronicle of Shakespearean controversies.

Redard, E. Shakespeare dans les pays de langue française. 1901.

Trentel, C. Shakespeares Kaufmann von Venedig in französischer Bühnenbearbeitung. 1901.

SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE. 177

Uhde-Bernays, Hermann. Der Mannheimer Shakespeare. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte

der ersten Shakespeare-Ubersetzungen. 1902.

Heft 25 of the 'Litterar-historische Forschungen.'

SOURCES AND INFLUENCES, ETC.

Anders, H. R. D. Shakespeare's Books. A dissertation on Shakespeare's reading and the immediate sources of his works. 1904.

Vol. 1 of the 'Schriften' of the 'Deutsche Shakespeare Gesellschaft. Originally intended as an introduction to a revised edition of Collier and Hazlitt's 'Shakespeare's Library,' which the Society hopes to produce. Altogether a most useful work.

Jung, Hugo. Das Verhältnis Middleton's zu Shakespeare. 1904.

Heft 29 of the 'Münchener Beiträge.'

Lanier, S. Shakespeare and his Forerunners. 1902, etc.

Lee, Sidney. Foreign Influences on Shakespeare. 1904.

In the author's 'Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century.'

Mascetta-Coracci, L. Shakespeare e i classici italiani. A proposito di un sonetto di Guido Guinezzelli. 1902.

Root, R. K. Classical Mythology in Shakespeare. 1903.

VII.

No. 19 of 'Yale Studies in English.'

Schelling, F. E. The English Chronicle Play. A study in the popular historical literature environing Shakespeare. 1902.

Emphasizing the indigenous growth and national spirit of the Historical Drama.

Thorndike, A. H. The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare. 1901.

Arguing with great force, first that Shakespeare's change from tragedies to romances is to be accounted for by the contemporaneous production of the Beaumont-Fletcher romances; and second, that these latter definitely influenced Cymbeline, A Winter's Tale, and the Tempest.

Evans, M. B. Der Bestrafte Brudermord: sein Verhältnis zu Shakespeare's Hamlet. 1902.

Bode, Emil. Die Lear-Sage vor Shakespeare, mit Ausschluss des älteren Dramas und der Ballade. 1904.

N

178 SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE.

Perrett, W. The Story of King Lear from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Shakespeare. 1904.

Palaestra, No. 35.

Kröger, E. Die Saga von Macbeth bis zu Shakspeare. 1904.

Palaestra, No. 39.

Holleck-Weithmann, F. Zur Quellenfrage von Shake-

speares Lustspiel 'Much Ado about Nothing.' 1902.

Chiefly by comparison with Jakob Ayrer's 'Comedia von der schöner Phänicia,' and Michael Kongeht's 'Die vom Tode erweckte Phönicia, Tragico Comedia.'

Heft 3 of the 'Kieler Studien zur Englischen Philologie.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND TEXT.

Bodleian Library, Oxford. The Original Bodleian copy of the First Folio of Shakespeare (The Turbutt Shakespeare). [By F. Madan, G. M. R. Turbutt, and Strickland Gibson. With 7 plates.] 1905.

Greg, W. W. Capell's Shakespeareana. A Catalogue of the Books presented by Edward Capell to the Library of Trinity College in Cambridge. 1903.

Phin, J. Shakespeare Notes and New Readings. 1905.

Prölss, R. Von den ältesten Drucken der Dramen Shakespeares, und dem Einflusse den die damaligen Londoner Theater und ihr Einrich-

tungen auf diese Dramen Ausgetübt haben. 1905.

Smith, C. A. The Chief Difference between the First and Second Folios of Shakespeare. [1901.]

Smith, A. R. A Handbook Index to those Characters who have speaking parts assigned to them in the First Folio. 1904.

Thiselton, A. E. Some Textual Notes on 'Measure for Measure.' 1901.

— Some Textual Notes on 'A Midsummer Night's Dreame.' 1903.

— Two Passages in Shakespeare's 'The Life of Tymon of Athens' considered. 1904.

BACON CONTROVERSY.

(a) BACON v. SHAKESPEARE.

Bayley, Harold. The Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon. 1902.

Attributing the Renaissance in general and Shakespeare's plays in particular to the Rosicrucians.

[Begley, Walter.] Is it Shakespeare? The great question of Elizabethan literature. Answered in the light of new revelations and important contemporary evidence hitherto unnoticed. By a Cambridge Graduate. 1903.

Bompas, G. C. The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays. 1902.

As might be expected from its authorship, this book is much more judicious than most in this section.

Bormann, E. Das Drama Henry VIII von Francis Bacon-Shakespeare. [With the text.] 1902.

— 300 Geistesblitze und Anderes von und über Bacon-Shakespeare - Marlowe, etc. 1902.

— Die Kunst des Pseudonyms. 1901.

— Das Lustspiel der Kaufmann von Venedig von Francis Bacon-Shakespeare Übersetzt und eingeleitet von E. Bormann.

— Der Shakespeare-Dichter. Wer wars? und wie sah er

aus? Eine Uberschau alles wesentlichen der Bacon-Shakespeare-Forschung, etc. 1902.

A survey of the controversy from the Baconian point of view.

Gallup, Mrs. Elizabeth. The Tragedy of Anne Boleyn. A drama in cypher found in the works of Sir Francis Bacon. [1901.]

Holzer, G. Bacon Shakespeare der Verfasser des 'Sturms,' etc. 1905.

Lewis, G. P. The Shakespeare Story: an outline. 1904.

Reed, Edwin. Bacon and Shakespeare Parallelisms. 1902.

— Francis Bacon our Shakespeare. 1902.

Stotsenburg, J. H. The Shakespeare Title. 1904.

Sutton, Rev. W. A., S.J. The Shakespeare Enigma. [1903.]

Theobald, R. M. Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light. 1901.

(b) SHAKESPEARE v. BACON.

Ashurst, R. L. Contemporary Evidence of Shakespeare's Identity. 1903.

No. 5 of the Publications of the Shakspeare Society of Philadelphia.

180 SHAKESPEARE LITERATURE.

SHAKESPEARE *v.* BACON—*continued.*

Calvert, A. F. Bacon and Shakespeare. 1902.

With portraits, etc.

Gervais, F. P. Shakespeare not Bacon. Some arguments from Shakespeare's copy of Florio's Montaigne in the British Museum. 1901.

Marriott, E. The Bi-literal Cypher. 1901.

Rowlands, J. Shakspeare still enthroned. [1903.]

Sullivan, Sir E., Bart. Verulamian: some observations on the making of a modern mystery, etc. 1904.

No. 49 of the Privately Printed Opuscula of the Sette of Odd Volumes.

Willis, W., Judge. The Shakespeare-Bacon Controversy. 1902.

Willis, W., Judge. The Baconian Mint: its claims examined, etc. 1903.

(c) NEUTRAL.

Dawbarn, C. Y. C. Bacon-Shakespeare Discussion, etc. 1903.

Reed, Edwin. Noteworthy Opinions, Pro and Con. Bacon vs. Shakspeare. 1905.

Neutral in substance, but the author adds a Baconian note at the end.

Webb, T. E., Judge. The Mystery of William Shakespeare, etc. 1902.

Judicial in form.

Wilde, J. P., Lord Penzance. Lord Penzance on the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy, etc. 1902.

In the form of a judicial summing up.

ARUNDELL ESDAILE.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES.



WHAT contributions do the municipal libraries make to the reading and study of Shakespeare? The question is a pertinent one at a time when it is rather the fashion to decry the rate-supported libraries.

The Shakespeare collection in the Birmingham Reference Library leaps at once to the mind as an answer. This great collection of world-wide fame is national rather than local. Yet the fact remains that it owes its completeness to municipal effort and support. True, the idea of a Shakespeare library for the great industrial capital of Shakespeare's native county did not originate with the municipal council. Mr. Sam Timmins and Mr. George Dawson, both residents of Birmingham, were the originators. But it was the encouragement given to the project by the Birmingham Libraries Committee which enabled the idea to be realized. And, when the first Shakespeare library of 7,000 volumes was destroyed by fire in 1879, the Libraries Committee, with the help of the community, set ardently to work to replace it. Not only was no time lost, but the new collection rapidly surpassed the old in the range and importance of its contents. With the four folios amongst its numerous treasures, the Birming-

ham Shakespeare collection of over 12,000 volumes is a magnificent instance of what a municipal library can accomplish.

Still, what Birmingham has done is not an answer to the question. Shakespeare's is the greatest name in English literature, and if the municipal libraries neglect him they plead guilty, to some extent at least, to the charge so loudly made, that they do little to encourage the reading of the best books.

In order to be able to give something like a reliable statement of the facts, I addressed letters of inquiry to about twenty librarians, and have received in reply a body of information which is suggestive and full of encouragement.

Birmingham is the only municipal library which can boast of possessing a copy of the first folio, but Lambeth and Liverpool have copies of the second, third and fourth folios; Manchester has the second and fourth, and the Cambridge municipal library has the 1607 issue of the 'Sonnets.' One or other of the reprints of the first folio are to be found in many of the libraries, but only eight appear in the list of subscribers for the Clarendon Press facsimile, a number disappointingly small, but it is probable that some copies found their way to municipal libraries through the booksellers. American public libraries are proverbially richer, and more energetic in their support of such enterprises, but America also only contributes eight public libraries direct to the list.

Birmingham is not the only municipal library which has made a point of Shakespeare literature. There is a Shakespeare Memorial Library in the

Free Library of Cambridge, comprising over a thousand volumes, brought together and presented by Mr. Henry Thomas Hall, who thus stated his reasons for making the collection: 'The works of Shakespeare reflect the highest honour on the country of his birth. They have had great influence in the formation of the English character, and are now exerting still greater influences, for they are being more extensively used than ever. The constant springing up of fresh editors and the frequent publication of new editions of his works demonstrate the great activity of thought and research which marks the Shakespearean literature of the day. To collect and preserve the works of such an author is a labour that each town possessing a Free Library should engage in, for by so doing they will afford every lover of his race an opportunity of making himself acquainted with the great poet of humanity, and at the same time promote the erection of the noblest monument to his genius whose 'powerful rhyme' shall 'out-live the gilded monuments of princes.' To assist in the fulfilment of this work is the object of the Cambridge Shakespeare Memorial Library.'

Birkenhead also has given special attention to the subject and boasts of about eight hundred volumes, including several fine scrap books and volumes of mounted pamphlets. Liverpool and Manchester have each about seven hundred volumes in their Reference Libraries, and from Leeds, Plymouth, Wigan and many other places come reports of collections ranging from a couple of hundred volumes upwards.

The Metropolitan Borough of Lambeth is not

only the proud owner of three of the folios, but its library is the depository of about five hundred volumes of works by and about Francis Bacon and the Bacon-Shakespeare question. These were a gift from a believer in the Bacon-Shakespeare heresy. It is certainly a convenience to have so large a contribution deposited in one centre, and students of Bacon should find it useful, apart from any controversial questions.

Turning to the lending departments of the libraries, it is quite clear that there is no dearth of opportunity for those who desire to borrow texts, or who wish to pursue the study of the plays with the aid of commentaries. As regards opportunity for the readers, the municipal libraries make an excellent show. Reports as to the use made of the opportunities vary. Mr. Folkard, Librarian of Wigan, writes that in the reference library an average of about twenty-five volumes per week are called for, chiefly editions of the text. At Aberdeen the Variorum and Henry Irving editions, together with Bartlett's Concordance, are kept on open shelves in the reference library, and are in continual use. In the lending department of the same library one hundred and seventy-six separate loans of texts of the works were made last year, in addition to numerous loans of books about Shakespeare, of which the details are not supplied. These replies from two centres totally different in character may be taken as examples of many others. There is, however, another kind of reply, not so encouraging, which seems to imply that there is need for some awakening on the subject. There are societies for the study of Browning,

and Dickens, and Omar Khayyam, but the promotion of the study of the greatest of all writers awaits the revivifying touch of some organization. To bring the great mass of readers to a knowledge of his works would be the greatest monument that could be raised to the genius of Shakespeare.

In various parts of the country local societies already exist—at Bristol and Clifton several Shakespeare Reading Societies are at work on private lines. Nottingham has a branch of the British Empire Shakespeare Society for reciting and reading plays. At Worcester the authorities of the Public Library have formed two circles to encourage the reading and study of Shakespeare. These circles have been in existence for the last six years, number about one hundred and twenty members, and meet in the Committee room of the Library twice in each week during the winter months. In April next the members propose to stage 'The Merchant of Venice' for six nights at the local theatre. An even more firmly established 'Society of Shakespeare Lovers' is associated with the Public Library of Dundee. For fifteen years this Society has met weekly in one of the rooms of the Institution for the systematic study of Shakespeare's works. Papers, discussions, and readings, with an occasional open night when friends are invited and a whole play read through by the members, make up the proceedings. Mr. Maclauchlan, the librarian, adds, 'I interpret your letter as meaning that there is some movement to promote the systematic study of Shakespeare in Free Libraries, at which I greatly rejoice.'

Lectures on Shakespeare have from time to time been given in many of the libraries, and short lists of books suitable for the general reader have been printed and circulated.

The municipal libraries can further extend and encourage the reading and study of Shakespeare amongst the masses. For a very small sum of money every library could print and circulate amongst its readers a slip containing a list of the texts, commentaries, biographies, and other works available, and, perhaps, a brief note on the pleasure and profit to be derived from the study of Shakespeare. If some well-known Shakespearean scholar could be persuaded to write a suitable note introducing the subject, it would meet with general acceptance. Libraries having volumes suitable might arrange a small exhibit in the library in the month of April. Such an exhibition was held in the Manchester Reference Library in April, 1905. The Clarendon Press and other facsimiles of the folios and quartos invariably arouse interest when so exhibited, especially if accompanied by a short descriptive note clearly written.

The books in the following list should find a place in every public library, though in the case of the numerous editions of the text a selection must, of course, be made in accordance with each library's requirements.

I. WORKS

Globe Edition. Ed., W. Aldis Wright. Macmillan,
3s. 6d.

Oxford Edition. Ed., W. J. Craig. Frowde, 2s.

MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES. 187

- Leopold Edition. Introd. by F. J. Furnivall.
Cassell, 3*s.* 6*d.*
- Alexander Dyce's Edition. 10 vols. Sonnenschein,
4*s.* 6*d.* each.
- Edinburgh Edition. Ed., W. E. Henley and
Walter Raleigh. 10 vols. G. Richards, 20*s.* each.
Remainder price about £3 the set.
- Eversley Edition. Ed., C. H. Herford. 10 vols.
Macmillan, 4*s.* 6*d.* each.
- Cambridge Edition. Ed., W. Aldis Wright. 9 vols.
Macmillan, 10*s.* 6*d.* each.
- Arden Edition. Gen. Ed., W. J. Craig. 40 parts
(16 published). Methuen, 2*s.* 6*d.* each.
- Larger Temple Edition. Ed., J. Gollancz. 12 vols.,
illustrated. Dent, 4*s.* 6*d.* each.
- Students' Edition. Ed., A. W. Verity. Cambridge
Press, 2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.* each.
One play to each volume. Three published.
- Variorum Edition. Ed., H. H. Furness. 15 vols.
published. Lippincott, 18*s.* each.

POEMS

- Sonnets. Ed., E. Dowden. K. Paul, 3*s.* 6*d.*
- Poems. Ed., Geo. Wyndham. Methuen, 10*s.* 6*d.*
- Elizabethan Sonnets. Introd. by S. Lee. 2 vols.
(Arber's English Garner). Constable, 4*s.* net
per vol.

BIOGRAPHIES

- Elze, Karl. William Shakespeare. Bohn's Lib.
Bell, 5*s.*

- Halliwell-Phillipps, J. O. *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare.* 2 vols. Longman, 21s.
- Lee, Sidney. *A Life of William Shakespeare.* Smith Elder, 7s. 6d.
- The same. *Abridged edition.* Smith Elder, 2s. 6d.
- Rolfe, W. J. *A Life of William Shakespeare.* Duckworth, 10s. 6d.

COMMENTARIES AND CRITICISM

- Bradley, A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy.* Macmillan, 10s. net.
- Brandes, Geo. *William Shakespeare, a Critical Study.* Heinemann, 10s. net.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare, etc.* Bohn's Lib. Bell, 3s. 6d.
- Courthope, W. J. *A History of English Poetry, Vol. IV.* Macmillan, 10s. net.
- Dowden, Edward. *Shakespeare. Literature Primers.* Macmillan, 1s.
- Dowden, Edward. *Introduction to Shakespeare.* Blackie, 2s. 6d.
- Dowden, Edward. *Shakespeare, his Mind and Art.* K. Paul, 12s.
- Gervinus. *Shakespeare Commentaries.* Smith Elder, 14s.
- Hazlitt, William. *Literature of the Age of Elizabeth and Characters of Shakespeare's Plays.* Bohn's Library. Bell, 3s. 6d.
- Hudson, H. N. *Life, Art, and Characters of Shakespeare.* 2 vols. Ginn and Co., 8s. 6d. each.
- Jameson, Mrs. *Shakespeare's Heroines.* Bell, 2s. net. *Illustrated edition,* Bell, 6s.

Morley, Henry, and Prof. Griffin. English Writers.

Vols. IX-XI. Cassell, 5s. per vol.

Moulton, Richard G. Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist. Clarendon Press, 7s. 6d.

Ransome, C. Short Studies of Shakespeare's Plots. Macmillan, 3s. 6d.

Seccombe, Thos., and J. W. Allen. The Age of Shakespeare. 2 vols. Bell, 7s.

Symonds, J. A. Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama. Smith, Elder, 7s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS

Abbott, E. A. A Shakespearean Grammar. Macmillan, 6s.

Bartlett. A Shakespeare Concordance. Macmillan, 21s. net.

Dyce, Alexander. Glossary to the Works of Shakespeare. Sonnenschein, 7s. 6d. net.

The new edition, edited by Professor H. Littledale, has been arranged for use with any edition of the text.

Hazlitt, W. Carew, ed. Shakespeare's Library. 6 vols. Reeves and Turner, 25s.

Out of print. Contains plays, romances, novels, poems, and histories used by Shakespeare.

Madden, D. H. The Diary of Master William Silence. Longmans, 16s.

A study of Shakespeare and Elizabethan sport.

Publications of the Shakespeare Society.

„ „ New Shakespeare Society.

The following books should also, if possible, be added when the foregoing have been supplied.

Collins, J. Churton. *Studies in Shakespeare*. Constable, 7s. 6d.

Fleay, F. G. *Shakespeare Manual*. Macmillan, 4s. 6d.

Stokes, H. P. *The Chronological Order of Shakespeare's Plays*. Macmillan, 4s. 6d.

Out of print, may be bought second hand.

Swinburne, A. C. *A Study of Shakespeare*. Chatto, 8s.

Ulrici, Hermann. *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*. 2 vols. Bohn's Library. Bell, 7s.

Ward, A. W. *History of English Dramatic Literature*. 3 vols. Macmillan, 36s. net.

Craik, Geo. L. *The English of Shakespeare*. Chapman and Hall, 5s.

Dodsley's *Old English Plays*. Ed., W. Carew Hazlitt. 15 vols. Reeves and Turner, 10s. 6d. each.

Out of print, second hand cost £5 or £6.

French, G. R. *Shakespeareana Genealogica*. Macmillan, 15s.

Out of print. Notes on dramatis personæ, characters, and the Shakespeare and Arden families.

Hazlitt, W. Carew, ed. *Fairy Tales, Legends, and Romances, illustrating Shakespeare*. John Pearson, 6s.

Manley, J. M., ed. *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*. Vols. I and II. Ginn and Co., 5s. 6d. per vol.

Pollard, A. W. English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes. Frowde, 7s. 6d.

Skeat, W. W., ed. Shakespeare's Plutarch. Macmillan, 6s.

Stone, W. G. Boswell, ed. Shakespeare's Holinshed. Lawrence and Bullen, 15s. net.

The facsimiles of the quartos and folios, and the Variorum edition of Dr. Howard Furness should also be acquired by every library. Where funds are not available, an effort should be made to acquire them by outside help.

JOHN BALLINGER.

TWO REVIEWS.

THE Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. Vol. I. The Text edited by Arnold Glover. Cambridge University Press, 1905.

By far the most important work which the Cambridge University Press has yet undertaken in the field of English literature is the edition of Beaumont and Fletcher in ten volumes, which is to appear in the series of 'Cambridge English Classics.' The misfortune which befel the project in January, 1905, in the death of the editor, whose work on Hazlitt and Johnson had made his name familiar to English scholars, led to some inevitable delay; but thanks to the zeal shown by Mrs. Glover and by Mr. A. R. Waller, to whose care the completion of the work has been entrusted, the difficulties have been overcome, and the first volume has at last appeared.

Since the first announcement of the undertaking in June, 1904, there has been some speculation among students as to the probable features of the edition, and all will have welcomed with interest the first instalment. The text selected for reproduction is that of the folio of 1679, and of this it has been sought to give as exact a reprint as possible. The degree of accuracy attained is, indeed, remarkable, and argues great care on the part of all

concerned. The closer the reader compares the reprint with the original, the greater will be his sense of its fidelity, and the more he knows of such work the greater will be his appreciation of the labour involved. It is, of course, primarily a question for the readers of the press, and these appear to have discharged their task in an exemplary manner. That in a book of this size oversights should occur was only to be expected, and to say that they do not detract from the value of a work, whose first aim is accuracy of detail, would be foolish; but they are so slight, and of such rare occurrence as to be hardly appreciable. If some are noticed here it is rather with the desire to put the present editor on his guard against possible sources of trouble than from any wish to detract from the merits of the volume. In the first place, one or two of the editorial rules seem ill-advised. Thus: 'It has not been thought necessary to record . . . the substitution of marks of interrogation for marks of exclamation and *vice versa*.' But in the seventeenth century the use of these points by no means always followed the modern practice, and though the printing was sometimes careless, to alter them without specific notice is unjustifiable. Nor has the modernization been carried out consistently. In the line (p. 9): 'How dull and black am I?' a point of exclamation has been substituted, though the query-mark is quite correct according to the old usage; while elsewhere (p. 267), 'Take heed?' has been allowed to stand, though the point is a mere misprint. So also, where the mark of interrogation appeared unnecessary, it has been silently replaced by a full point (as twice

vii.

o

on p. 268). How closely it was intended to adhere to the typographical peculiarities of the folio is not clearly stated, nor does the practice appear to be altogether uniform. In the earlier sheets an attempt was made to follow the original in its confusion of roman and italic punctuation, but this proved too much for the editorial vigilance, and in the later plays the practice was abandoned. Other deviations are rare, though they occur now and then, as on p. 93, where, in l. 17, a comma is omitted after 'these' and in l. 20 an apostrophe before 'tis.'

Of course, the most difficult problem to be faced was the treatment of misprints. The rule laid down is admirable: to correct only evident misprints and to indicate all such corrections by the use of brackets. But the practice is hardly consistent. On p. 11 we have 'mid-[n]ight' for 'mid-might,' but in the very next line 'them' is retained in place of 'thee,' literally without either rime or reason. Similarly, on p. 118, the obvious misprint, 'dowcers' is quietly accepted, and on p. 119 the equally impossible 'Haunces.' On p. 164 'Panthe' is allowed to stand for 'Panthea.' Such oversights, however, are greatly preferable to any undue tampering.

Rather less satisfactory than the reprint itself is the collation of the quartos. The transcripts of the title-pages contain a number of small inaccuracies. On p. 449 occurs a more serious error. After the title of the 1651 quarto of the 'Scornful Lady,' is the note: 'The British Museum copy lacks the printer's device on the title-page possessed by the other copies seen; it varies also slightly in spelling, etc.' This copy belongs, of course, to a distinct

edition, and the failure to recognize this fact throws out the numbering of the quartos from this point. What is chiefly to be regretted, however, is that the readings of the quartos are not more fully recorded. One instance must suffice. On p. 18 occurs the line: 'To bed then let me wind thee in these arms.' This is ambiguous, the sense varying according as a pause is made before or after 'then.' It is, therefore, eminently a case in which we require the readings of the quartos; but none are given. It may be remarked that the text of 1641, at least, reads 'To bed, then' in opposition to Dyce. These are, however, for the most part, trifling errors in a big work, and printer and editor alike deserve commendation for the manner in which they have discharged their respective tasks.

There is, unfortunately, another matter which calls for discussion; the choice, namely, of the folio of 1679 as the text to be reproduced. That the folio, with its outward uniformity, its fairly consistent practice of spelling and punctuation, offered certain conveniences to an editor is obvious. There was, however, the further question whether it offered a sufficiently satisfactory text to be worth reproducing, and this question must be emphatically answered in the negative. The editor may, however, be absolved of responsibility in this connection. Not only is the choice of a single publication as the basis of the text consistent with the method adopted in other works in the series of 'Cambridge English Classics,' but the real reason which governed the choice is too patent to be ignored. Granted that some early edition was to be

followed, it was only by taking for reproduction the second folio, a working copy of which can be obtained for about the price at which the Cambridge edition is published, that a reprint could be produced at the popular price intended, and a popular price was necessary because it had to compete with an elaborate and expensive edition which had already been for some years in preparation.¹ We have of late become familiar enough with the cheap reprint of the popular publisher, which is often very useful; an academic press issuing such a work and announcing it as a scientific edition is a novelty. As for the defence in the preface of the text adopted it is mere special pleading which will deceive nobody, and the fact that variants are given (though great difficulties are put in the way of reference, through the lines not being numbered) in no way excuses the offering to readers a hopelessly corrupt text. How bad that text is will become apparent when we consider the history of the plays in question.

Any work the folio may contain by either of the authors mentioned on the title-page must have been written by 1625. By the closing of the theatres in 1642 seventeen of the plays had been published in quarto, and in 1647 thirty-four other plays had been collected into a folio volume. One further play was published as a supplement to the folio in 1652. Thus in the case of thirty-five plays

¹ In the 'Introductory Note' is the remark: 'During the progress of work upon the present issue another edition has been announced, under the general editorship of Mr. A. H. Bullen, and the first volume was published last year.' The implication is erroneous. Mr. Bullen's edition has undoubted priority of inception as well as publication.

the text of 1679 is based on the previous folio; in that of seventeen on previous quartos, and in most cases on the latest and most corrupt. It is no wonder that editors have bestowed little praise upon this text, and there is no evidence in support of the view put forward in the present reprint that its 'failings' have been in any way 'exaggerated.' Equally imaginary are the 'advantages' for details of which the reader is artlessly referred to the original booksellers' preface. The worthlessness of such advertisements is notorious, and the present specimen is so patently mendacious as to lose all semblance of authority. The publishers there claim to have printed from a copy of the 1647 edition of the plays in which 'an ingenious and worthy Gentleman' had 'Corrected several faults (some very gross) which had crept in by the frequent imprinting of them.' Yet they must have known as well as we do that the plays in that edition were all printed for the first time. The plays which had become almost unrecognizable in the late quartos through 'the frequent imprinting of them' they made no attempt to correct. So again they mention the addition of lists of all *dramatis personae*, though in the case of five plays none appears. Their claim to have added 'several Prologues and Epilogues' is another deliberate lie. So much for the authority of the 1679 text when based on the earlier folio.

To illustrate the use made of the quartos take such a play as the 'Elder Brother.' Of this five quartos were printed between 1637 and 1678, and they exhibit a pretty constant and pretty thorough

debasement of the text. Most noticeable is the fact that whereas the first quarto prints the play correctly as verse, the last re-arranges the whole as prose. The folio follows this last quarto, and the Cambridge Press has pinned its faith on the folio. The result is that, if in future volumes the editors adhere to the practice of the present, the whole of the quarto text of the 'Elder Brother' will have to be printed in the appendix, simply because the utterly worthless text of 1679 is followed in the body of the work.

From the prospectus of Mr. Bullen's edition the preface to the present reprint quotes the opinion that 'for the use of scholars, there should be editions of all our old authors in old spelling.' This is perfectly true, but it in no way justifies the present venture. The modern scholar demands a text with unsophisticated spelling, not because there is any mystic virtue in an old spelling text, but because any deviation from the earliest authoritative edition may involve the alteration of the text as it actually left the hand of the author. The Cambridge Press has adopted a text which is separated from the earliest procurable in many cases by half, in no case by less than a quarter of a century, and which contains the accumulated errors of from two to seven more or less careless compositions. The spelling of 1679 may be old spelling for us to-day, but it is not the spelling of 1625, and it is this, or the nearest approach obtainable, that is of interest to students of Beaumont and Fletcher. Thus though editor and printer will receive deserved recognition of their careful work, the scheme as a whole can

bring no credit to the Cambridge Press in quarters where English scholarship is the serious concern of students.

W. W. GREG.

POSTSCRIPT.—Since the above was written the second volume has appeared. As was anticipated, the verse text of the 'Elder Brother' has been reprinted in the appendix: what could hardly be foreseen was that Mr. Waller, who is apparently the responsible party, would select one of the later quartos for the purpose. The edition, which he has chosen to call A, bears, indeed, the date 1637, equally with another edition, which he calls B. Not only, however, is it perfectly clear from the readings that A was printed from B, and not *vice versa*, but no one familiar with seventeenth century typography can help suspecting from the style of the printing that the date is a fraud and that the volume was in fact issued somewhere between 1650 and 1660!—W. W. G.

II.

Venus and Adonis, 1593: Lucrece, 1594: The Passionate Pilgrim, 1599: Shakespeare's Sonnets, 1609: Pericles, 1609: reproduced in facsimile from the earliest editions, with introductions by Sidney Lee. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1905.

If Mr. Lee has kept us waiting for his work, the work has proved well worth waiting for. The introductions to the various poems reproduced form a monument of Shakespearean criticism of the first importance. No doubt, belief in all Mr. Lee's theories cannot be held necessary to literary salvation, nor can he claim to have said the last word on any of the innumerable and difficult problems with which he deals, but so far as the patient collection and collation of evidence is concerned his work may reasonably be accepted as final.

The work of reproduction has been carried out to perfection by the Oxford Press, and the whole get up of the work in any of the various styles in which it is issued is most attractive. Besides the regular facsimiles, the title-pages of numerous later editions have been reproduced, to illustrate the very full bibliographies appended to the introductions, though it is a little difficult sometimes to follow the principle on which the choice has been made. We miss particularly the 'Venus and Adonis' of 1594, though except for the date this agrees closely with the 1593 title-page, and the 'Poems' of 1640. The title-pages given are reproduced for the most part in half-tone, and it has unfortunately been found necessary on this account to roll certain sheets, which makes the surface of the paper very unpleasant. The difficulty could have been obviated by reproducing the title-pages in collotype, which is a more satisfactory process from every point of view.

The tale of 'Venus and Adonis' is traced with minute care from its obscure origins in Eastern mythology through the lost ritual songs of the early days of classical Greek literature and the earliest extant poems relating to the subject, the work of Alexandrian idyllists, to its later treatment at the hands of Roman, Italian, French, Spanish and English writers. Exactly how much of this literature Shakespeare knew it is difficult to determine, but Mr. Lee thinks that an acquaintance can be shown with some at least of the Italian work. The point in which Shakespeare's poem stands more or less alone is the insistence on Adonis'

coyness, which becomes the main feature of the tale. This was not invented by Shakespeare, since both Greene and Marlowe are explicit enough upon the point, but he was the first so far as is known to develop the suggestion. Mr. Lee thinks that Shakespeare developed Marlowe's hint, with the help of the tale of Salmacis and Hermaphroditus. Given the hint, Shakespeare would hardly need any assistance but that of his own imagination; but it is likely enough that the influence of the other Ovidian myth had made itself felt at an earlier period, and probably in some Italian or Latin work which has so far eluded search, for Greene as well as Marlowe has to be reckoned with, and as Mr. Bullen has pointed out, 'Titian's famous picture in the National Gallery affords sufficient proof that Shakespeare was not the first to depict Adonis' coldness.' Another story to which Shakespeare probably owed something is that of 'Glaucus and Scilla,' as told by Lodge in 1589, though the degree of dependence implied in Mr. Lee's remarks is but indifferently borne out by the parallels quoted.

The literary history of the story of Lucretia is traced with similar fulness through Livy, Ovid, St. Augustine, the 'Gesta Romanorum,' Boccaccio, Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate, Bandello and other writers. In treating of Shakespeare's sources Mr. Lee contends that the chief indebtedness was to Ovid, a smaller obligation is allowed to Livy, while Bandello, whose novel was accessible and probably read in a French translation, may have supplied occasional hints. Further, it is shown that Shake-

speare owed something tangible alike in treatment, incident and phrasing to Daniel's 'Rosamond,' and in a far less degree here and there to Constable's 'Diana.' In the same manner, when we turn to the 'Passionate Pilgrim,' we not only find an ample account of all the known circumstances attending that literary venture, but also a minute history of each of the twenty-one poems it contains.

It is, of course, in dealing with the 'Sonnets' that Mr. Lee is on the most controversial ground. His views are in general too well known to need setting forth in this place, and it will be sufficient to say that he has collected a good deal of fresh evidence in support of his contentions, though that does not necessarily mean that he has always proved his case to the satisfaction of his critics. Certainly as a basis for the poet's biography, the 'Sonnets' are about as unsatisfactory as possible. The so-called autobiographical interpretation, which would make these poems the direct and truthful record of the inmost secrets of the poet's heart, ignores both the conditions of poetic creation and the mental attitude of a great dramatist. But Mr. Lee's interpretation is properly no less 'autobiographical.' The question between him and Canon Beeching, for instance, is not as to whether or not the 'Sonnets' relate to actual circumstances of the poet's life, but whether they reflect the affection and friendship he bore to certain unnamed persons, or his sycophantic courting of a patron. Certainly the self-possessed and manly tone of the addresses to Southampton makes it difficult to believe in the hysterical adulation

which the adoption of the second alternative presupposes. But the critic of the 'Sonnets' is not bound to accept either of these views, nor yet, in its entirety, the theory that they are merely literary exercises on imaginary situations. Mr. Lee has himself demolished the idea that any authority attaches to the arrangement of the 'Sonnets' in the first edition. Each individual poem, or each obviously connected group, must stand on its own feet. Some may perhaps be, what Mr. Lee imagines, mere flattering addresses to a patron — Southampton, Pembroke, or another. Others again may be the exact reproductions of Shakespeare's own feelings inspired by actual events, while yet others may be mere imaginative exercises. Most likely of all, perhaps, the majority partake in ever varying and undefined degrees the characteristics of both these latter classes. Mr. Lee supports his 'patron' theory with much ingenuity and resource. The instances quoted in his 'Life of Shakespeare' as illustrating the 'love' of poets for their patrons, have, however, been shown by Canon Beeching to be quite inconclusive, and it is to be expected that, in spite of the numerous fresh examples here brought forward, many readers will still fancy that they detect, between the verses of these literary retainers and Shakespeare's 'Sonnets,' a difference not of art and imagination merely, but of intention and inspiration as well. In treating of the mysterious dedication, Mr. Lee is on firmer ground, and his unwearying efforts in search of parallels to every phrase it contains have met with a fuller measure of success. The William Hall theory has been relegated to a note,

which serves at once to clear the main issue and render the general contention less open to criticism. This certainly appears to be the most satisfactory—or the least unsatisfactory—explanation yet advanced, and a provisional acceptance of it will do far less harm than coquetting with any of the more sensational theories. At the same time it may be well to point out that Mr. Lee has hardly realized the force of the contention that the phrase ‘the eternitie promised by our ever living poet’ is both pointless and far fetched unless the person addressed is the person to whom it had been promised, and also that in contending that ‘begetter’ cannot have the force of ‘inspirer’ he appears to be advancing beyond the limit warranted by the facts.

The same elaborate care characterizes the treatment of the literary history of ‘Pericles.’ The chief interest of this introduction, however, is bibliographical, and in this aspect the work is perhaps not quite so satisfactory. Mr. Lee repeats his former assertion that the play was excluded from the collection of 1623, ‘either owing to Pavier’s unreadiness to part with his interest, or to suspicions on the part of the editors of the first folio as to the authenticity of the piece.’ With regard to the first part of this statement, it has been already pointed out when reviewing Mr. Lee’s former work, that Pavier’s edition was purely surreptitious, and that whatever rights there were really belonged to Blunt, who was one of the folio syndicate. Moreover, it is hard to believe that Pavier should have refused in the case of ‘Pericles,’ leave which he granted in that of 2 and 3 ‘Henry VI.’ By the ‘editors of

the first folio,' are presumably meant Heminge and Condell, but to what their 'editing' amounted is quite unknown, though the exclusion of the present play may suggest that it was merely nominal.

Although far from exhausting the many points of interest which arise in connection with Mr. Lee's work, the above remarks will perhaps suffice to indicate its importance. It is safe to say that no Shakespearian student, whatever may be his opinions with regard to particular theories, can afford to neglect these essays, or can read them without the greatest interest and profit. There are, however, certain matters of detail which Mr. Lee may perhaps be induced to reconsider should an opportunity of revision occur. It is whispered that the introduction to the folio facsimile may possibly be reprinted in book form; it is to be hoped that if that is to be the case, the present introductions to the poems and 'Pericles' will not be omitted.

One danger of the enthusiast into which Mr. Lee has fallen is that of seeing Shakespeare everywhere. Thus he makes Southwell deplore, 'from the Christian point of view, the pagan frankness' of 'Venus and Adonis.' He gives no reference, so that it is difficult for the reader to ascertain whether or not Southwell anywhere alludes to Shakespeare's poem, but the lines quoted about 'stilling Venus' rose' obviously apply to amatory verse in general, and have no direct bearing upon the subject in hand. Poor Barnfield cannot even copy some lines of Ovid into a commonplace book without being supposed to have Shakespeare's 'Lucrece' in mind; nor can

Sidney give the name of Pyrocles to a character of his romance without being thought to have suggested to Shakespeare the name of Pericles. Meres, it should be remarked, though he evidently ranked Shakespeare first among contemporary dramatists, did not call him, and very likely did not regard him as, 'the greatest poet of his era.' Two rather serious slips must also be mentioned here. One is the mis-translation, on two occasions, of a common Italian word. 'Stagione' does not mean 'spot' or 'trysting-place,' but 'season.' The other relates to the sources of Shakespeare's plots. 'Bandello's collection of tales,' we read, 'either in the original Italian, or in the French translation, was the final source of the plot of . . . "Hamlet."' Of course Mr. Lee knows as well as anyone that the Hamlet story is not found in Bandello, but in Saxo Grammaticus, and was thence borrowed by Belleforest, whose collection is only in part a translation of Bandello, but it is certainly to be desired that greater care should be taken to avoid confusions of this kind.

Perhaps the most serious point on which a reader may feel disposed to quarrel with Mr. Lee is a textual one, one lying on the borderland between the critical and the typographical. This is the strange persistence with which he seeks to impose a purely arbitrary standard of orthography, to import an idea of uniformity into sixteenth-century spelling which simply did not then exist, and to stigmatize whatever will not conform to his ideas as a misprint. Many of the forms cited as errors of the press, or as 'Spelling eccentricities which are scarcely to be differentiated from misprints' were perfectly recog-

nized, and are supported by the best authorities. Thus 'ghesse' is merely an Italianate, as 'guess' is a Gallicized form, and it would have required prophetic powers in a sixteenth-century printer to know which would commend itself to the judgment of a Shakespearean critic of the twentieth; 'prease' is a genuine phonetic variant of 'press,' and often rhymes with 'peace,' as in Sidney's famous sonnet. The same applies to 'randon'; while the form 'Ay,' which Mr. Lee would substitute for 'I,' is so rare as itself to be almost incorrect; and 'y' have,' in Sonnet CXX., is, as the spacing shows, not an error for, but a correction from 'you have.' There is a curious misunderstanding where Mr. Lee says that 'Brackets are wrongly introduced in,

But since your worth (wide as the Ocean is)
The humble as the proudest saile doth beare.
(*Son.* 80.)

The brackets merely stand for commas, as in the examples Mr. Lee has cited just before; the sense being 'since your worth which is wide as is the ocean,' not, as he evidently took it, 'since your worth is as wide as the ocean.' Worst of all, however, is the inclusion among 'confusing misprints' of 'sounding' and 'sound,' for 'swooning' and 'swoon' respectively. They are, of course, perfectly correct and recognized forms, which occur over and over again in Elizabethan works. That a leading Shakespearean scholar could be guilty of such an oversight as this is an awful warning against the complacent manner in which we habitually modernize and mutilate old texts.

A few miscellaneous points may be mentioned. As evidence of the carelessness of the compositor of the 1609 'Sonnets,' we are informed that 'The initial "W" of Sonnet LXXIX is from a wrong fount.' The remark is a little unhappy, for there are at least thirty-six cases of an initial wrong fount in the 'Sonnets,' many of them far more glaring than that selected by Mr. Lee for the pillory. The date of 'Mucidorus' is wrongly given as 1595 instead of 1598. The John Harrison who printed the 1600 edition of 'Lucrece' is said in one place to have been the son, in another the grandson, of the holder of the copyright. It is implied that the 'Whole Contention' is wanting in the Capell copy of the 'Pericles' volume of 1619, whereas the parts have merely been bound up in the wrong order. A well-known bookseller of Charing Cross Road is erroneously referred to as 'Mr. Bertram.' There is also a certain sprinkling of misprints though they are of no great importance. The attribution of a 'Ghost Hunting Coney Catchers' to Greene is the most serious. Lastly, we must protest most strongly against such atrocities as 'catalogve,' 'novveavx,' 'Lavrence,' and 'Ddiv.'

These may be small points, but accuracy is always desirable, even when one is writing on Shakespeare, and if the remarks offered above facilitate the removal of certain defects from a useful and generally admirable work they will not have been made in vain.

W. W. GREG.

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

FEW books of note on Shakespeare, or on matters connected with him, have appeared of late on the Continent. But the acting of him in the theatres, especially of Germany, is as frequent as ever (nine hundred and thirty-five representations of twenty-four plays of Shakespeare by one hundred and eighty-six theatres were given last year), and that does more perhaps to keep him alive than fifty volumes of criticism or controversy. German critics have been exercising their minds over the platform stage, and such books as Brodmeier's 'Die Shakespeare-Bühne nach den alten Bühnenanweisungen,' and Proelss's 'Von den ältesten Drucken der Dramen Shakespeares' have been much discussed in England. I came lately across a curious Russian book by Vladimir Vasilevich Stassov on 'Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice and the Shylock Problem.' The author maintains that Shakespeare's characters are not, as most critics will have it, all Englishmen, but that he differentiates nationalities in a marvellous way, and nowhere more than in the characters of Shylock or Othello. His remarks on the characters of 'The Merchant of Venice' are most depreciatory. He considers them, vulgarly speaking, 'a poor lot' with the exception of Shylock, who is the only respectable, manly person in

VII.

P

the piece. On him injustice is heaped by the others, who consider themselves just. Shakespeare, according to this critic, knew that things were always so in this world, and desired to show it. Stassov compares the Merchant with Tolstoy's 'Power of Darkness' for a picture of human wickedness, stupidity, and prejudice. There is a German translation of this strange work.

The second volume of Heinrich Bulthaupt's 'Dramaturgie des Schauspiels' deals with Shakespeare, and contains some suggestive criticism. 'Shakespeare-Vorträge,' Vol. VI, by the late Friedrich Theodor Vischer, contains the Roman plays, and brings the series to an end. There is a full index of the whole work, which, it will be remembered, gives the text of the play in what Vischer considered the best German translation, with the comments critical and verbal made by him as he read the plays with his students in class.

* * * * *

It is difficult to decide how to deal with Gerhart Hauptmann's new play, 'Und Pippa tanzt.' It is a sort of fairy drama of happiness, and belongs to the same class as 'Die Versunkene Glocke.' But although even there the inner meaning takes some trouble to trace, it can be found, and the melodious verse lends an unspeakable charm to the whole. The new play is a somewhat incoherent phantasmagoria from which it is not easy to unravel the very slight thread of story and allegory the poet intends us to seize. It is in prose, with one or two lapses into verse of a not specially distinguished order.

The first act however is extremely good. The scene is a tavern in the Silesian mountains, the resort of the glassmakers who work in a neighbouring factory. They are drinking and playing cards, warm and comfortable, forgetting the icy winter outside. Pippa, the daughter of an Italian glass-blower, a warm-blooded girl who turns the heads of the Germans, is made to dance for their pleasure. A quarrel arises over the cards, and her father is stabbed to death. In the confusion, Huhn, a former glass-blower, a sort of *Tiermensch*, carries Pippa off to his ruined hut. Thither she is followed by a wandering glassmaker, Michel Hellriegel, who is so clever that he understands everything except what reality means. He is the enthusiast, the dreamer, who will never reach anything in a practical way, the poet with a longing for the sun; his imagination finds the most miraculous happenings perfectly reasonable. If he is hungry and cold, his fancy makes him declare that he has suffered nothing, lost nothing, and he goes on triumphing towards the enchanted castle promised him in his childish dreams. He kisses Pippa, they escape together from Huhn's clutches, only to fall later into those of Wann, the astronomer and magician. Wann knows and foresees everything, brings Huhn and Pippa to their death, blinds Michel, and in that condition, after much needless instruction in the art of dreaming, sends him forth to further wandering. Beginning as realistic drama, continuing as a fairy tale, and ending as a moral lesson, the story defies analysis. Pippa is doubtless meant to be winged imagination and hope, the

wish that is never fulfilled, except in the artist's dream. For Huhn she is the flame that every glass-blower seeks; for Michel she means a glimpse into the beauty of this world. Work like this, if really great, if really fulfilling its aim, must be, as it always is in the hands of a master, clear and comprehensible. One lays down the book of Hauptmann's drama with a feeling of bewilderment, and a strong desire to grapple next with something very real and quite commonplace.

A certain class of writers expend themselves on one delightful book and then seem unable to do anything else. In 'The Letters that never reached Him' the Baroness von Heyking achieved a well-deserved success, and I turned eagerly to her new volume, 'Der Tag Anderer'; to my disappointment I found a volume of short stories (nothing, as usual, indicating that the volume was not filled with one tale), of no great distinction. The title story has a theme in great vogue just now. A mother, still young and a widow, whose marriage had been loveless and unhappy, refuses the chance of a second and happier marriage because she fears the criticism of her daughter, aged seventeen, the girl in question being herself comfortably engaged to the son of an American millionaire. It strikes us as an absurd and useless sacrifice of the happiness of two persons, but curiously enough, in all these cases the woman seems to think only of herself and never of the man. Another story, 'Gewesen' (the past), has some of the charm of the author's first book. The scene is Mexico: the *milieu* diplomatic. A woman meets again, after

many years of a loveless marriage with a wealthy diplomat, the lover of her youth, now a distinguished traveller and explorer. Her mother, a worldly, ambitious woman, had contrived to separate them on account of his poverty and lack of position. Now they met again: but what was the use of it? She was not of those women who are disloyal to their husbands, and so there was nothing left to the lover of her youth but to go away.

'Der Goldene Ring,' the first story in Ernst Heilborn's 'Ring und Stab: zwei Erzählungen,' is a study in the difficult art (or should it be science?) of platonics (in this case the experiment ends in marriage and does not remain exactly platonic up to that consummation), so loved of the German soul. Berthold is the ordinary selfish man of refined tastes and susceptibilities who only begins to realize how much he loves Gertrud, when he has, as he fears, lost her for ever. Gertrud, a teacher in a high school in Berlin, was a rigid sort of person, and we never quite see how she could have had any charm for Berthold. It must, however, have been great, for, to salve her conscience, she set down certain rules for their intercourse. She insisted on paying her own share of the expenses of their common amusements, and as she was poor (he was very well off) he had to be content with travelling third class on their Sunday outings into the country, with cheap seats at the play, with tramcars instead of cabs, and with third-rate restaurants and confectioners. She would also accept no gifts from him except flowers for her room, and would not consent to dress to please him. Her clothes were never pretty, and

the green woollen petticoat displayed every time she lifted her skirts to cross a road or enter a tramcar offended his aesthetic taste. When a friend of hers becomes engaged, Gertrud almost envies her the conventionalities of a public betrothal. The story is, however, very well told, and interests as such stories do, but it is not so good as a similar study by Gabriele Reuter, 'Der Lebenskünstler,' or as a short story by Sudermann in the volume entitled 'Im Zwielficht.'

'Le Bel Avenir,' by René Boylesve, is the only recent French novel that calls for any detailed notice. It is a study of the education of three young men. Alex, accompanied by his widowed mother, comes from a quiet country house near Poitiers to Paris to study law. He is an average young man, of pleasant manners, and a general favourite, but wholly unintellectual. He leads the usual life of a Paris student, fails in his examination, and, having sown his wild oats, makes a sensible marriage, *i.e.*, chooses a wife with a *dot*, returning to the quiet country life he left as a boy. Paul, the son of a Parisian, a friend of Alex's mother, is a type of the prig, and Hilaire, the son of a woman of the lower class, a *protégé* of Alex's mother, a type of the youth who profits by his opportunities. There are many side issues, but the start in life of these young men is the main theme. It is well presented, simply, straightforwardly, almost without comment from the author. Perhaps the most sympathetic character is that of the little *grisette* who loved Alex so unselfishly.

* * * * *

The story of 'Julie de Lespinasse' is as, if not more, fascinating than any novel. But never has it been so well or so fully told as in the Marquis de Ségur's just published volume. The book is a monument of careful research. Many fresh sources have been explored, and much unpublished material of importance brought to light. Not only Mlle. de Lespinasse, but the persons with whom she was most closely connected, are treated in great detail, and we derive incidentally a picture of the society and the times in which she lived. We feel her charm, and study with ever fresh interest the psychological problem of a woman passionately and sincerely in love with two men at the same time, one of whom died of consumption, and the other married some one else. The author has admirably succeeded in his aim of placing his heroine in her right atmosphere, in grouping 'Autour d'elle les gens de son entourage habituel, d'insister particulièrement sur ceux qui exercèrent une action sur sa destinée.' Thanks to documents placed at his disposal, he has for the first time drawn a full-length portrait of M. de Mora, Julie's Spanish lover. Indeed, all the passages in her life which have hitherto seemed obscure, are made quite clear here by documentary evidence, and thus the Marquis de Ségur's book must remain the definitive one on the subject. Every one knows the main facts of the story of Julie de Lespinasse. Without birth, fortune, or beauty, by the charm of her mind and heart alone, she became the friend of d'Alembert, and created a salon that was frequented by the most distinguished persons of a brilliant

epoch. It was not until the publication, five-and-thirty years after her death, of her letters to Guibert, that those of her friends who were still alive knew that she had been the victim of a burning and devouring passion for him. Every one had believed that her strange moods and the alteration in her health were caused by the death of her first lover, M. de Mora. Her relations with d'Alembert, who took up his abode with her from 1765 to her death in 1776, were purely platonic, and she seems never to have appreciated at its true worth his unselfish affection for her. Had M. de Mora lived, and had she not met Guibert, there seems little doubt that Mora would have married her. Guibert never really greatly loved her, and though at times during their *liaison* he was carried away by the ardour of her passion rather than by that of his own, she was not the only woman with whom he had relations, and he ended by making the conventional French marriage with the usual *jeune fille*. It is one more instance of a woman of intellect and character wasting her love on a weak, worthless man. Even after she comes in some degree to recognize his true self, she goes on loving just the same.

'I like nothing by halves,' she writes to him, 'nothing that is indecisive, nothing that is only a little. I pay no heed to the talk of the people I meet in society: they amuse themselves and yawn: they have friends and love nobody. That seems to me deplorable. Yes, I prefer the torment which consumes my life to the pleasure which deadens theirs. My soul was not made for the petty interests of society. To love, to suffer, heaven, hell, that is

what I should devote myself to, that is what I wish to feel, that is the climate in which I desire to live, and not the temperate one in which the fools and automatons who surround us live.'

Indeed, the soul-drama here laid before us is more striking and arresting than anything fiction has to give us: it is life itself stripped of all its outer wrappings. And with regard to our judgement of the heroine of this strange story, we can only echo the closing words of the Marquis de Ségur's admirable book:

Pour nous qui avons pu suivre jour par jour les phases de cette existence tourmentée, et pénétrer profondément dans les replis de cette conscience, ne devons-nous pas accorder à l'héroïne de cette histoire l'indulgence qu'on ne refuse guère aux créatures humaines dont l'âme intime nous est connue et qu'il nous est loisible de juger d'après leurs sentiments plus que d'après leurs actes? Elle a gravement péché sans doute, mais elle a cruellement expié; et, si elle a beaucoup souffert, au moins a-t-elle beaucoup vécu. Peut-être ne faut-il ni la condamner, ni la plaindre.

* * * * *

In June, 1904, a Rousseau society was founded at Geneva, and there has just been published the first 'Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau.' The object of the society, which, by the by, seems to have very few English members, is to develop and co-ordinate all studies relating to Rousseau, his work, and his time; to publish a critical edition of his works; to unite under the name of *Archives Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (after the fashion of the *Goethe-Schiller Archiv* at Weimar) manuscripts,

printed books, portraits, medals, and all kinds of documents relating to Rousseau; to preserve the monuments, buildings, and picturesque sites recalling Rousseau's memory; and to publish periodically a collection of memoirs and documents. The hope is expressed that in some ten or twenty years the student of Rousseau will go to Geneva with the same certainty of finding every source of information in the Archives there, as the student of Goethe or Schiller now goes to Weimar. The contents of the first volume of '*Annales*' are of great interest, and include, among other things, '*Rousseau et le docteur Tronchin*,' by Henry Tronchin; and '*Quelques documents inédits sur la condamnation et la censure de l'Emile et sur la condamnation des Lettres écrites de la Montagne*.'

A word may here be fitly said of the excellent work being done by the municipality of Paris in regard to the history of the city. In 1899 it instituted a commission, the members of which include, besides the municipal councillors, such men as Jules Claretie, M. Delisle, members of all the academies, notable architects and artists, curators of museums, etc., charged '*de rechercher les vestiges du vieux Paris, de constater leur état actuel, de veiller, dans la mesure du possible, à leur conservation, de suivre, au jour le jour, les fouilles qui pourront être entreprises et les transformations jugées indispensables, et d'en conserver des preuves authentiques*.' This is done at the expense of the municipality, and volumes of transactions, fully illustrated with photographs, are issued at frequent intervals. The volumes I have been fortunate enough to see (they

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 219

are not to be purchased), contain an account, for instance, of the history of the ancient parish cemetery of Ste. Marguerite, with eight photographs and a facsimile plan of the place as it was in 1763 and 1790; of the Hôtel de Villette, maison mortuaire de Voltaire in the Rue de Beaune, with five photographs; of the Palais de Thermes, preserved under the Boulevard St. Michel. The descriptive letterpress is by well-known antiquaries. The whole forms an admirable historical guide to old Paris. Would that something similar were being done for London!

* * * * *

In Elie Berger's '*Histoire de Blanche de Castile reine de France*,' we have one of those fascinating historical books of which the French alone seem to possess the secret. As the mother of Louis IX (St. Louis) for whose education and upbringing she is responsible, she has sufficient title to fame. Her biographers have generally devoted themselves to praising her piety, charity, and courage, and regard her chiefly as the mother of a great king. But she takes high rank among the founders of French national unity, and her policy is even more remarkable than her virtues or private qualities. The author has made excellent use of all available documents preserved either in France, England, or Rome, and has produced a work of the highest value, and a fine portrait of a great woman.

Il y a des figures que les siècles n'arrivent pas à détruire ;
elles semblent grandir à mesure que leur entourage dis-

paraît par l'action fatale de l'indifférence et de l'oubli. La reine, Blanche de Castile, qui a travaillé, combattu et souffert pour la vieille France, que l'Espagne nous a donnée pour le triomphe de la civilisation, n'est un étrangère pour personne, les plus ignorants savent son nom. Cette popularité posthume, dont beaucoup ne connaissent plus la cause, mais que nul ne songe à contester, est la récompense des services qu'elle a rendus à sa seconde patrie.

A book of similar interest is 'Mémoires du Général Marquis Alphonse d'Hautpoul, pair de France, 1789-1865,' published by 'son arrière-petit-fils' Estienne Hennet de Souter. D'Hautpoul was a soldier, a politician, and a minister; his life was full of adventures and great deeds, and as the memoirs were never intended for publication, the book is as diverting and instructive as an historical novel. It is the simple story of the life of an 'homme de cœur, loyal soldat et parfait gentilhomme,' traced rather with the point of the sword than written with a pen. He took part in the Prussian campaign of 1789-1808, and in the Spanish, 1808-12. He was a prisoner in England, 1812-14. He was Minister of War, and then of Foreign Affairs, 1849-50.

Of French books dealing with contemporary history the most important is André Cheradame's 'Le Monde et la Guerre Russo-Japonaise.' It is certainly one of the best books on the subject yet published. The first part deals with the complex causes of the war; the second contains the essential documents relative to the negotiations which preceded hostilities, and to the war itself, with a succinct summary of the principal events of the struggle; the third is concerned with the new situation created

for every great state of the world by the Russo-Japanese conflict. The conclusion gives a sketch of the general foreign policy seemingly the best to re-establish the equilibrium of forces destroyed by the defeat of Russia. The volume is a great contribution to philosophical as well as to political history.

* * * *

In philosophy two books are worth mention. The first, Norero's '*L'Union mystique chez Saint-Thérèse*,' is an interesting psychological study. Norero maintains that the state of St. Theresa's soul is interesting not only to Catholic theologians, but also to contemporary psychologists, for she presents an example of exact introspection and penetrative analysis. He endeavours to reconcile the incontestable observations of science with the legitimate affirmations of conscience, and first describes the different modes of mystic union in St. Theresa from the subjective point of view of her immediate consciousness. He then analyzes its principal factors from the objective point of view of psychology, and lastly tries to appreciate its significance and value for the human consciousness. I do not remember any other book in which mysticism is treated in so scientific a manner, and it has roused much attention and interest among leading French and English psychologists.

As a nation we are inclined to take a wholly practical view of our history and ourselves. It has remained for a Frenchman, Jacques Bardoux, to write on the psychology of war crises in contem-

222 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

porary England. The most interesting chapters in his 'Essai d'une Psychologie de l'Angleterre Contemporaine: Crises belliqueuses' are those that deal with the question of war as revealed in contemporary literature. The varying and various views of Carlyle, Dickens, Ruskin, Froude, Mrs. Browning, Tennyson, Kingsley, and later, those of Karl Pearson, Henley, and Kipling, on war and peace are very cleverly analyzed. The conclusion, so far as he arrives at one, is that the peace-loving views of Mrs. Browning, Ruskin, and Dickens gave way to contrary forces less exceptional and less permanent. The arguments throughout the volume are most ingenious, and help us to see ourselves as others see us.

* * * * *

The following recently-published books deserve attention:

'Le Voyage de Sparte.' Par Maurice Barrès.

An impressionist travel book in which we have Sparta as M. Barrès sees it, not necessarily as it is. He comes to the conclusion that Greece is good, and if France through the intermediary of Rome is descended from Greece, it is an honourable task to defend a civilizing influence on French soil—but France, *i.e.* Lorraine, is best.

'Sous le Fardeau. Roman social.' Par J.-H. Rosny.

A pamphlet-novel dealing with the misery of the lower classes of Paris. The hero, a doctor, practising in the poorer quarters of the city, has every opportunity of getting acquainted with wretchedness born of poverty and crime.

RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 223

‘Joseph Dombey, médecin, naturaliste, archéologue, explorateur de Pérou, du Chili, et du Brésil. 1778-1785. Sa vie, son œuvre, sa correspondance.’ Par Le Dr. E.-T. Hamy.

In the eighteenth century France had a great interest in voyages of exploration, and missions were sent out by the government or the Academy of Science, or the great trading companies. It was Turgot who, at Condorcet's suggestion, sent Dombey to Peru and Chili, and this book is a most interesting and full account of the expedition.

‘Madame de Charrière et ses amis d'après de nombreux documents inédits, 1740-1805. 2 vols. Par Philippe Godet.

In an unpublished letter to Charles Berthoud in 1808, Sainte-Beuve expressed regret that there was not ‘une Madame de Charrière complète faite en Suisse à Neuchatel.’ His wish is now realized by Godet's charming book about a charming woman. Madame de Charrière was a friend of Rousseau, and wrote delightful letters.

‘Napoléon et sa Famille.’ Vol. VII (1811-1813). Par Frédéric Masson.

The continuation of an important contribution to Napoleon literature. This volume shows less the influence of Napoleon on his family than the influence of his family on him and his work. In these years he no longer exalts or degrades his brothers, but they become the artificers of his fall, thus proving that Napoleon chose and employed bad tools, and made them worse by his contradictions and weaknesses.

‘Les Druides et les dieux Celtiques à forme d'animaux.’ Par H. D'Arbois de Jubainville.

Lectures delivered at the Collège de France. The book contains chapters on the conquest of Great Britain by the Gauls, on the Druids in Great Britain and in Ireland, on their doctrine in regard to the immortality of the soul, on metempsychosis in Ireland, and on the gods taking the forms of animals in the epic literature of Ireland.

224 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

'L'argot au XX^e Siècle. Dictionnaire Français-Argot.' Par Aristide Bruant.

A new edition, with supplement. The classical word is given with all its various slang equivalents.

'Theodor Mommsen als Schriftsteller. Ein Verzeichnis seiner Schriften.' Von Karl Zangemeister.'

A most useful list, arranged chronologically, of Mommsen's works from 1837 to 1905, including articles in periodicals, and the names of those printed works to which the great historian furnished introductions or other matter. There is a full index.

'Lettres de Catherine de Médecis.' Publiées par M. Le Comte Baguenault de Puchesse. Vol. IX. 1586-1588.

This is the last volume of a very valuable work forming one of the series in the collection of unpublished documents on the history of France, issued under the auspices of the Minister of Public Instruction. It contains full indices to the whole work.

Les éléments sociologiques de la morale.' Par Alfred Fouillée.

This book works out still further the new idea that ethics is a branch of sociology.

'Le Rêve. Etudes et observations.' Par Marcel Foucault.

The author deals in very interesting fashion with the evolution of the dream after sleep and with the state of consciousness during sleep. A fascinating chapter discusses 'feelings' in dreams.

'Critique de la doctrine de Kant.' Par Charles Renouvier (publié par Louis Prat).

A wonderful criticism of the Kantian philosophy written by a man eighty-seven years of age.

ELIZABETH LEE.

5.